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INTRODUCTION

Colombi and Roca (2003) explain that when it comes to immigrants (and immigrant languages) in the United States the issue is not the acquisition of English—which is readily and rapidly accomplished– but the erosion of the heritage language that takes place with the passing of time and generations “if these languages are not nurtured and supported by families, the communities, and the schools” (p. 6). In the United States, Spanish is one of those immigrant languages. Despite being the “fastest growing language group in the United States” (retrieved from: http://www.cal.org/sns/ [01/14/10]) and having a robust presence in our society, Spanish as heritage language could erode and be potentially lost (Oh & Au, 2005) due to the influence of schooling, language use and attitudes, cultural attitudes, and secondary or sub-status (Valdés, 2001).

Hispanics are the fastest growing minority group in the United States (Marotta & García, 2003) and Spanish is the most common heritage language in the United States (Shin & Bruno, 2003; Oh & Au, 2005). According to Oh and Au (2005), Spanish “as a heritage language is maintained at higher rates than other heritage languages in the US” (p. 230).

As of 2007 the estimated Hispanic population of the United States was 45.5 million people. Of that number, 34 million spoke Spanish at home. Portes and Hao (1998) reported that 82% of Hispanic adolescents in the U.S. believe their Spanish speaking ability is good or very good; however, 71% of these adolescents also prefer to speak English. Oh and Au (2005) add that second generation Hispanics in the U.S. are less willing to teach their heritage language to their children, which could lead to a “growing numbers of Latino adults [who] will not be able to
speak their heritage language” (p. 237). This inability will in turn result in erosion or complete loss of the heritage language by the third generation (Oh & Au, 2005).

According to the 2000 Census, in the state of Georgia where this study took place, 734,000 individuals or 7.6% of the population were of Hispanic or Latino origin\(^1\) compared to 108,922 in 1990 (retrieved from: http://www.sbdc.uga.edu/pdfs/hispanicfactsheet.pdf [01/14/10]). Fifteen percent (94,000 individuals) reportedly spoke only English at home, while the remaining 85% (538,000 people) spoke languages other than English at home. These data rank Georgia at 10\(^{th}\) in the nation in terms of Hispanic population (retrieved from the following two sources: Pew Hispanic Center, http://pewhispanic.org/states/?stateid=GA; U.S. Census Bureau http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/13000.html).

In terms of education, Georgia’s Latino student population has been on the rise from less than 2,000 in 1976 (Brown et al., 1980), to more than 28,000 in 1996 (Georgia Department of Education, 1996), to 179,000 in 2008 (Pew Hispanic Center, http://pewhispanic.org/states/?stateid=GA). Latinos in Georgia have tended to be less than average to finish school. They have also been more likely to struggle in the classroom, and less likely to have instructors from their ethnic background (Hamann, 1997). Ninety percent of US teachers are white (National Education Association, 2003), and 97% are monolingual English (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996). Based on these statistics, one may conclude that heritage language speakers (HLSs), particularly Spanish heritage language speakers (Spanish HLSs),

---

\(^1\) The U.S. Census Bureau (2008) defines the expression *persons of Hispanic or Latino origin* as “…those people who classified themselves in one of the specific Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino categories listed on the Census 2000 questionnaire – ‘Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano,’ ‘Puerto Rican’, or ‘Cuban’- as well as those who indicate that they are ‘other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.’… [which] include those whose origins are from Spain, the Spanish-speaking countries of Central or South America, the Dominican Republic or people identifying themselves generally as Spanish, Spanish-American, Hispanic, Hispano, Latino, and so on. Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race. Thus, the percent Hispanic should not be added to percentages for racial categories.
have not been receiving the support they need in order to excel in our school system, as well as maximize and capitalize on the tremendous gift of their multilingualism. The present study was developed with the purpose of gaining some insight on one indication of language loss – simplification and loss of linguistic features in heritage language. Specifically, this study looked at Mexican and Colombian HLSs’ language use with regard to the subjunctive mood when compared to monolingual Spanish speakers (MONOs) from Mexico and Colombia.

Now, who is a heritage language speaker (HLS)? In the literature, the term has been defined in a variety of ways. A general definition of HLS includes learners of all proficiency levels who study their family’s heritage language (e.g., Fishman, 2001); while a narrower definition stresses the manner in which the heritage language is acquired; citing language use in the home, the community, and heritage language formal education courses (e.g., Valdés, 2001). The term HLS is relatively new (Valdés, 2001, p. 38); a dissatisfaction with prior terms such as “native speakers, quasi-native speakers, residual speakers, bilingual speakers, and home-background speakers” (Valdés, 1997, p. 13; see also Carreira, 2004; Lynch, 2003; Valdés, 2001) led to an increased use of other terms such as “home background speakers (as used in Australia) and heritage language speakers (as used in Canada)” (Valdés, 2001, p. 39). In the present study the term Spanish Heritage Language Speaker (Spanish HLS) was used to refer to:

1) Individuals born of native Spanish-speaking parents from Colombia or Mexico and raised in a Spanish-speaking family/environment in the United States; or

2) Individuals born in Mexico or Colombia who moved to the United States before age 13.

In terms of productive as well as receptive language ability heritage language speakers’ skills vary widely (Valdés, 1997). Valdés (2001) uses the notion of a proficiency continuum (originally coined by Silva-Corvalán, 1986; see also Martínez Mira, 2009; Schreffler, 2007;
Silva-Corvalán, 1991) to explicate the situation. At one end of the spectrum are the HLSs considered partially receptive or disfluent speakers (Bills, 1997), and at the other, those HLSs who are deemed highly fluent individuals who possess almost native-like levels of the heritage language in comprehension and production skills.

With regard to oral proficiency for example, Fairclough (2005) and Hislope (2003, 2002) observe that many Spanish HLSs have native-like production of their heritage language when discussing everyday topics and issues that relate to their families and communities. However, proficiency levels of these same HLSs are challenged and decrease when the topics and tasks become more complex or demanding\(^2\) even at the oral production level (Hancock, 2002), or when they deal with the same daily and family topics using different skills such as reading and writing. This research highlights the fact that even if bi/multilingual individuals are able to use their two or more languages, they usually possess a linguistic preference when discussing different topics such as personal life, religion, and academics (Valdés, 2001). Other linguistic challenges documented among Spanish heritage language speakers include the use of subjunctive mood in Spanish (Fairclough, 2005; Silva-Corvalán, 1994), and the use of written language mechanics such as spelling and written accents marks (Hancock, 2002). Scholarship has also investigated the effects of instruction on the linguistic development of HLSs when compared to L2/FL Spanish learners (Potowski, Jegerski, & Morgan-Short, 2009), and the influence of home and community exposure to Spanish on receptive subjunctive abilities (Mikulski, 2010) among HLSs when compared to Spanish L2 learners.

The traditional yard-stick against which HLSs have been measured has been monolingual speakers of the same languages (Valdés, 2001). More recently, HLSs’ linguistic abilities have

---

\(^2\) Some examples are: expressing more abstract thoughts, such as: political opinions, talking about literature or literary analysis; as well as, educational, professional, and personal careers or goals).
also been compared to second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) learners of the heritage language who are not heritage speakers. Recent research on second language acquisition (SLA) and bilingualism, however, has begun to emphasize the unique characteristics of bilingual and multilingual individuals, emphasizing that they are not simply double (or triple, etc.) monolinguals (Valdés, 2001) but rather cognitively and linguistically distinct from monolinguals and L2/FL students (see e.g. Cook, 1999). Nevertheless, comparing heritage language speakers to monolinguals and to L2/FL Spanish learners can be a useful means of determining potential erosion of the heritage language in situations of language contact (as is the situation in the present study), different rates of language acquisition or comprehension in classroom instruction, or differential productive and receptive skills. Assessing such differences could be extremely useful when considering and making recommendations for curriculum and course development for heritage language speakers, as well as innovations and improvements in heritage language instruction, and curricula development for heritage language teacher preparation.

Given the demographic growth among Hispanics in the U.S. and the growing presence of HLSs in American schools, this study aimed to document aspects of HLS language proficiency and use in one specific area; namely, the subjunctive mood by HLSs. The use of the subjunctive mood among HLSs was chosen as the focus of this study because:

1) There is already a documented tendency among Spanish native speakers of certain countries\(^3\) to simplify and avoid the use of the subjunctive (Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Gutiérrez, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979). Thus, this seems like an area of Spanish that might be particularly vulnerable to language loss among HLSs;

2) The Spanish subjunctive is challenging for all learners including Spanish native speakers (Pérez-Leroux, 1998; Blake, 1985, 1983);

\(^3\) Argentina, Mexico, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela.
3) Subjunctive mood is a relatively low incidence form among monolinguals (in written as well as in oral use) compared with the indicative mood (Biber et al., 2006; Collentine, 1997);

4) Even though the Spanish subjunctive is undergoing simplification and avoidance in some native speaker usage, the subjunctive mood remains prescribed in formal usage by Spanish language academies and represents a major part of any Spanish as a foreign language curriculum;

5) Subjunctive mood use in English is even less frequent than in Spanish (Whitley, 2002), suggesting that use of the subjunctive might be even more minimal for Spanish speakers in Spanish-English contact situations;

6) Previous studies have suggested that mood simplification, erosion, and loss are not only the norm but become accelerated when these phenomena are already happening among native speakers of the language (Colombi, 1997; Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994, 1991).

Taking these six points into consideration, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1) Do Spanish HLSs in the U.S. use the subjunctive mood in Spanish?

2) Do Spanish HLSs recognize obligatory contexts for subjunctive use?

3) Do Spanish monolinguals use the subjunctive more than the Spanish HLSs?

4) Are Spanish HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish influenced and simplified by their dominant language (English) when compared to the subjunctive use amongst monolinguals?

5) Does usage differ by level of focus on formality and form; i.e., speaking vs. writing?

6) Does HLSs’ usage parallel difference in usage of the subjunctive between Mexican and Colombian monolinguals?

Studies such as the one presented in this paper are paramount due to a constant and continued growth of the Hispanic population in the United States as a whole (Guzmán & Díaz
McConnell, 2002) and specifically in Georgia (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The growing ubiquity of the Spanish language in the U.S. society, where it is the most widely spoken language after English (Shin & Bruno, 2003), means accommodating the increasing Spanish HLS population in the United States. There is thus a dire need to develop Spanish instructional programs tailored to the linguistic knowledge and needs of this population. This study contributes one linguistic feature that may characterize Spanish HLSs and distinguish them from Spanish monolinguals, subjunctive use. Having a clear idea of what heritage language speakers bring with them into the classroom and the areas that are lacking or more prone to erosion will contribute to the development of curricula and lesson plans that will maximize HLSs language learning. This study further adds to the body of data regarding the state of Spanish as a heritage language amongst speakers from different national backgrounds, Colombian Americans and Mexican Americans.

This study finds that the picture of dramatic and rapid heritage language erosion suggested by Oh and Au (2005) is not universal. Findings will suggest that Colombian and Mexican HLSs have not lost command or interest in learning Spanish heritage language. A second contribution of this study is to provide a picture of Spanish HLSs’ command and use of the subjunctive mood in adjective and noun clauses when compared to monolingual Spanish speakers. A third contribution is to look at how level of formality and focus on form affects HLSs’ subjunctive knowledge and use. The study used a continuum of three different tasks that ranged from least to most formal; starting with a task demanding spontaneous oral production, followed by a written task, and ending with a grammaticality judgment task focused specifically on language form.
Chapter 2 explains verb mood in Spanish and English and reviews three areas: a) relevant research on the acquisition of the subjunctive mood by Spanish native speakers, L1 English-L2/FL learners of Spanish, and by Spanish heritage language speakers; b) theories related to language acquisition and Spanish mood; and c) prior studies on Spanish subjunctive mood use among Spanish heritage language speakers in the United States. Chapter 3 describes the study’s methods. Chapter 4 recounts and discusses the study’s findings. Chapter 5 provides implications of the study’s findings for theory and pedagogy and offers suggestions for further research.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Spanish and English Mood Systems

To date, most studies regarding HLSs in the United States have focused on educational policy (see, e.g. Byrnes, 2005), instructional methodologies (Valdés, 1997; Vásquez, 1990), curriculum development (Fairclough, 2005), and language learning strategies (Hancock, 2002). Far less attention has been devoted to systematic exploration of HLSs’ language proficiency and use, or the influence that their dominant language (in this study English) might have on their productive and receptive skills in their less dominant language (in this study Spanish).

One reason why these areas have been minimally explored is the heterogeneity and variation in the linguistic skills repertoires of Spanish HLSs (Valdés, 2001). Silva-Corvalán (1986) has dubbed this phenomenon the bilingual continuum4 (see also Martínez Mira, 2009; Schreffler, 2007; Silva-Corvalán, 1991) and has developed a linguistic skill scale to categorize Spanish HLSs in a spectrum that ranges from “Spanish-dominant” to “English-dominant” (Schreffler, 2007, p. 27). This study contributes an additional dimension to this work, looking at Spanish mood selection by Spanish HLSs with regard to level of formality and focus on form.

This chapter begins with a review of differences in the indicative and the subjunctive mood in English and Spanish and presents previous research on the acquisition of the Spanish subjunctive mood by Spanish monolinguals, L2/FL learners of Spanish, and Spanish heritage language speakers. Secondly, theories related to language acquisition and mood in the Spanish language are discussed. Finally, the chapter ends with an overview of prior studies on subjunctive use among Spanish HLSs in the U.S. relevant to the present work.

---

4 Silva-Corvalán (1986) defines the “bilingual continuum” as “a series of lects ranging from full-fledged to emblematic Spanish and, vice-versa, from full-fledged to emblematic English” (p. 395).
**Mood: The Indicative and the Subjunctive**

Before delving into mood, two important phenomena should be considered: modality and mood. Modality refers to “any lexical or morphological expression [of the speaker’s] commitment to the truth value of a statement” (Collentine, 2010, p. 40), for instance expressions such as *es posible* (it is possible), *tal vez* (maybe), and *creo que*… (I believe that…) convey different degrees of assertability and commitment with what is being said, and therefore express modality; on the other hand, mood “is an inflectional representation of modality” (p. 40); i.e., the use of a certain verb ending.

**English and Spanish Mood Systems**

The English and Spanish languages possess at least two moods: the indicative and the subjunctive. Some scholars also include the imperative mood as a third mood in the Spanish language (Haverkate, 2002). However, not everyone agrees with the imperative being an independent mood because it uses a combination of forms from the indicative and the subjunctive moods (Terrell, 1976).

When comparing English to Spanish, the different tenses of the indicative mood in both languages can be explained, taught, and used in the same contexts by paralleling one language’s uses to the other. Arguably, when translating or interpreting sentences in the indicative mood between English and Spanish the content, implications, presuppositions, and face-value understanding obtained from this translation/interpretation would be the same for readers/speakers of both languages (Whitley, 2002). Examples (1) and (2) below using the present and preterite tenses of the indicative mood in Spanish can be translated verbatim into English without needing any extra explanation or modifications in order for the statements to be meaningful in either language:
This apparent mood compatibility between English and Spanish found in the indicative mood disappears when the subjunctive mood is considered. In fact, it could even be argued that the aforementioned compatibility between English and Spanish in the indicative mood is an oversimplification developed to make Spanish as an L2 or an FL more accessible to learners although in terms of rules the proximity between indicative moods in both languages is much closer than when discussing the subjunctive mood.

When using, translating, teaching, or explaining the subjunctive mood tenses to traditional L2/FL learners of Spanish whose first language is English, the Spanish subjunctive poses a major challenge\(^5\) (Collentine, 1997; Schane, 1995; Terrell, Baycroft, & Perrone, 1987). Whitley (2002) indicates that the reason for the latter is that in English the subjunctive mood is dying, and that its tenses are nothing but “relics” (p. 125). Due to the latter, English speakers grow increasingly “unsure of when they hear or read [it]” (p. 125) in their own language.

L1 English speakers find it challenging to learn the subjunctive mood in Spanish or to contrast it with the indicative mood (Lubbers-Quesada, 1998; Schane, 1995; Terrell & Hooper, 1974) due to two compounded elements: 1) the aforementioned paucity of a similar structure in English; and 2) what Whitley (2002) describes as a lack of clear and unanimously agreed upon rules that explain and classify the Spanish subjunctive mood.

The indicative mood’s rules are clear, concise and in many instances identical to English rules. Its use conveys a commitment to the truth value of what is being said, connotes focalized

---

\(^5\) This challenge has been problematic not only for Spanish students and their Spanish instructors (Terrell & Hooper, 1974; Schane, 1995; Lubbers-Quesada, 1998), but also for grammarians and theorists (Terrell & Hooper, 1974).
information (i.e., foreground information), and it is usually found in independent clauses (i.e., statements that do not require other information to be understood). On the other hand, rules for the subjunctive mood’s use are unclear to L2/FL learners whose first language is English (Whitley, 2002) because of the mood’s intrinsic characteristics presented in the next section.

**The Spanish Subjunctive Mood**

When comparing frequency of mood usage among monolinguals, the subjunctive mood is generally lower than the indicative mood in written as well as in oral use (Biber et al., 2006; Collentine, 1997). There are three generally accepted traits of the subjunctive mood in Spanish. First, the subjunctive is the mood of pragmatic non-assertion (Batchelor & Pountain, 2005; Mejías-Bikandi, 1998; Lunn, 1989a; Terrell & Hooper 1974; Rivero 1971) or of lack of commitment to the statement (Collentine, 2010). Non-assertion and lack of commitment do not mean lack of truth-value; rather, it suggests the attitude of the speaker towards the statement being made (Mejías-Bikandi, 1998; Palmer, 1986/2001; Bybee, 1985). Secondly, when complements represent old (known) information or when the information presented is not relevant or is defocalized (i.e., background information), the old, irrelevant, or defocalized information may appear in the subjunctive mood because from a discourse perspective it represents low degrees of informational value (Collentine 2010; Haverkate, 2002; Mejías Bikandi, 1998; Lunn, 1989a; Lavandera, 1983). Third, the subjunctive mood in Spanish represents a redundant marker of modality usually introduced by the dependent clause (Collentine, 2010): i.e., “from the need to emphasize [indicative] and deemphasize [subjunctive] information in discourse” (Lunn, 1989b, p. 700). For instance, when doubt is expressed as in *Dudo que este coche sea bueno* ‘I doubt that this car is good,’ the language used in the independent clause (*dudo que*) lets the interlocutor know that what is being expressed is a doubt
(el coche sea [SUBJ] bueno), therefore the dependent clause presents the doubted information in the subjunctive mood.

In Spanish the employment of the subjunctive mood varies with the intent of the language user. It may appear in obligatory contexts (i.e., in contexts where the subjunctive mood is the only possibility); in optional contexts\(^6\) (i.e., where the speaker can opt for the indicative or the subjunctive moods depending on what they want to express); or in determined contexts (i.e., where its implementation follows or obeys certain conditions that allow for alternatives to the use of the subjunctive mood). Furthermore, the speaker can also choose to omit or avoid the subjunctive mood by using circumlocution or alternative ways of expression.

An instance of an obligatory context for the subjunctive is when in Spanish the language user tries to influence someone else’s behavior by expressing volition (want/desire). For example:

(3)  *José quiere que Lucía vaya a la ceremonia.*

José wants [volition] that Lucía go [SUBJ] to the ceremony.

Two examples of optional contexts are presented in examples (4) through (7) below.

When expressing feelings in Spanish such as fear and being afraid of something (both represented by the morpheme *temer* in Spanish), depending on the message the speakers wish to convey, they will employ either the indicative or the subjunctive mood. The indicative will be used in order to express a polite assertion (i.e., to fear something is true – as in example (4) below) (Terrell & Hooper, 1974); and the subjunctive will be employed in order to express genuine fear (being afraid of something, i.e., fearing someone’s actions – as in example (5) below).

\(^6\) What Ahern & Leonetti (2004) call “double mood selection” (p. 44)
Polite statement:

(4) Temo que Olivia es irresponsable
I am afraid that Olivia is [IND] irresponsible

Genuine fear:

(5) Temo que Olivia sea irresponsable
I am afraid that Olivia will be irresponsible [SUBJ]

Another example in which Spanish language users can make a choice is when using an impersonal expression such as es esencial que ‘it is essential that’, because if used with the subjunctive mood the message conveyed is that of an indirect command (as in example (6) below), and when combined with an infinitive the message is that of an affirmative statement without explicit influence or indirect command (as in example (7) below).

Indirect command:

(6) Es esencial que Gabriel llegue temprano
It is essential that Gabriel arrive [SUBJ] early

General affirmative statement without explicit influence expressed:

(7) Es esencial llegar temprano
It is essential to arrive [infinitive] early

Examples (6) and (7) connote how important it is that Gabriel arrive early; however, in example (6) the speaker is trying to influence Gabriel’s actions through an indirect command by using the subjunctive mood. Example (7) on the other hand, hedges the subjunctive by stating a general assertion (also stating the importance of Gabriel arriving early) employed by the language user as an assertion. A tendency to use infinitives in Spanish (as seen in example (7)) for expressing general directives or truisms (such as beliefs and rules) has been increasingly documented among monolinguals. The infinitive form has been documented to be used instead of the subjunctive
mood with the intention of softening the tone of the statement, for example, when trying to make a statement more polite or less direct (Batchelor & Pountain, 2005).

The subjunctive is used when verbs such as querer ‘to want’ or decidir ‘to decide’ are employed in trying to influence someone else’s behavior as seen in example (3), except for instances where the subject of the main and the dependent clauses is identical, in these cases Spanish requires the use of infinitives (and not the subjunctive mood) as in example (8):

(8)  *Teresa quiso/decidió comprar el libro*
     Teresa wanted/decided [IND] to buy [infinitive] the book

In (8) Teresa wanted/decided to buy the book, whereas in (9) below, Bautista is trying to influence Teresa’s actions:

(9)  *Bautista quiso/decidió que Teresa compre el libro*
     Bautista wanted/decided [IND] that Teresa buy [SUBJ] the book

Situations and contexts in which monolinguals circumvent or avoid the implementation of the subjunctive altogether have been documented. In these cases, monolinguals use infinitive forms, or fragmented language such as lists of adjectives, nouns or a combination of the two. Subjunctive circumvention and subjunctive avoidance were observed and documented in the present study. Statement (10) below exemplifies a case of subjunctive circumvention/avoidance that could have appeared in the data produced by monolinguals in this study. For example, when asked about preferences or traits regarding an entity unknown to the speaker, some monolinguals could have replied with a fragmented statement (a list of adjectives):

(10)  *Busco a una persona amable, dedicada, y trabajadora*
     I am looking for a nice, dedicated, and hard working person

If example (10) were to have been expressed in a complete sentence (i.e., including a verb), the speaker would have employed the subjunctive mood as in example (11):
I am looking for a person who is nice, dedicated, and hard working.

In this study it was predicted that Spanish HLSs would be able to use the subjunctive in Spanish, but not as often or accurately as their monolingual counterparts. As a result, it was anticipated that whenever possible, HLSs would tend to avoid its use more often than the monolinguals. This avoidance would be observed in two possible formats: 1) simplification, or 2) employment of alternative ways of expression that would circumvent the use of the subjunctive. Despite the simplification and avoidance, it was predicted that HLSs’ statements would be perfectly understandable to Spanish monolinguals albeit not using the expected mood.

The Acquisition of the Subjunctive Mood in Spanish

At first glance, the subjunctive’s apparent simpler morphology and fewer tenses – when compared to the indicative mood – could make it seem that the subjunctive mood would be simpler and potentially more accessible and easier to learn. However, the subjunctive mood poses unexpected difficulties due to its pragmatic uses not only to Spanish learners who are L1 English speakers (Batchelor & Pountain, 2005; Lubbers-Quesada, 1998), but also to children who learn Spanish as their L1 (Pérez-Leroux, 1998; Blake, 1985, 1983). This difficulty tends to result in late acquisition (when compared to the acquisition of the indicative mood) among all learners (from monolinguals to L2/FL learners) (Collentine, 2010); and it has been directly connected to three (psycho)-linguistic elements: 1) context, 2) speaker’s intention, demanding interlocutor’s intuition (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004), and 3) cases of “double mood selection” (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004, p. 44), meaning that in certain contexts both Spanish moods can be used with identical triggers/antecedents/matrices, but with different messages as seen in examples (4) and (5) above (and (30a) and (30b) below) where the language user is able to
change the meaning of a statement by modifying the mood used in it (i.e., from expressing reservation to expressing genuine fear).

Although acquiring the Spanish subjunctive mood is challenging for native Spanish speakers (Pérez-Leroux, 1998; Blake, 1983), its use has been documented in children’s speech as early as ages 2.1 and 2.4 (López Ornat, 1994). It is believed that by age five Spanish-speaking children approach adult levels of subjunctive mood use in Spanish in two areas: 1) indirect commands; and 2) adverbial or relative clauses (Blake, 1985) while Spanish subjunctive mood implementation in other constructions and contexts might take longer (Pérez-Leroux, 1998; Blake, 1983). L1 English speakers learning Spanish as an L2/FL have difficulty employing the subjunctive in appropriate contexts regardless of the number of years of instruction (Collentine, 2010; Gudmestad, 2006; Lubbers-Quesada, 1998; Stokes & Krashen, 1990). The aforementioned findings on mood acquisition among monolinguals, namely that the subjunctive mood in Spanish is challenging for monolinguals, and that it is acquired by monolinguals relatively late (when compared to the indicative), in phases, and through a lengthy and multifaceted process—might provide some insights into HLSs’ acquisition7 and use of the Spanish subjunctive mood. These findings could also explicate a potential challenge that HLSs might face when acquiring and implementing the Spanish subjunctive: i.e., an incomplete development of the intuition required to use and understand the subjunctive (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004) among monolinguals. This lack of intuitive knowledge is paramount to this study when considering the unique circumstances of HLSs who learn and use their heritage language in a situation of language contact in which the heritage language (which is many times their first language) is not the societal dominant language.

7 Described as an “incomplete” by Montrul (2002).
Lavandera (1983) and Whitley (2002) have observed that monolinguals choose mood and tense according to the meaning they wish to convey, not according to strict rules that pre-determine the tense or mood to be used. If in fact tense and mood use in Spanish is directly tied to meaning, then, the intricacies of the Spanish mood system would be better acquired in natural settings than in a classroom setting. Since HLSs grow up hearing (and in many cases using) Spanish, they could be expected to retain a monolinguals’ “feel” or “intuition” when making a decision between the subjunctive and the indicative moods (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004). However, it could also be argued that the Spanish system of these bilingual HLSs is influenced and becomes simplified as a consequence of their dominant language system (in this case the English system), or that their Spanish system represents a case of incomplete language acquisition due to schooling in their second language (in this case English). The question of a potential influence of English on Spanish mood choice and, in particular, the influence that English might have on the HLSs’ use of complex clauses in Spanish involving mood choice are the focus of the present study.

In summary, acquiring the Spanish subjunctive mood and using it correctly is challenging due to: 1) the mood’s linguistic structure; 2) the subtleties and nuances in meaning conveyed by verbal mood; and 3) the relative infrequency of subjunctive use, with monolinguals choosing not to use the subjunctive mood in Spanish in optional contexts or to use circumlocution. Because of the difficulties and challenges tied to the subjunctive mood, it is a likely candidate for a form that might be incompletely acquired by HLSs living in non-Spanish medium societies. Next, I present a theory of cross-linguistic influence (CLI) in order to paint a general picture of linguistic consequences of language contact.
**Cross-linguistic Influence**

It is common for languages in contact to influence each other (Montrul, 2004; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Dorian, 1981), especially when the contact is long-term and it takes place between a dominant or majority language and a minority language, such as is the case of English and Spanish in the United States (Montrul, 2004; Silva-Corvalán, 1994, 1986). Kellerman and Sharwood Smith (1986) originally coined the term *cross-linguistic influence* (or CLI) defining it as “…the influence of a person’s knowledge of one language on that person’s knowledge or use of another language” (p. 1). CLI has been also known as *linguistic transfer* (Odlin, 1989; Selinker, 1972) and *interference* (Weinreich, 1953/1968). While the terms transfer and interference are currently employed in the literature, the expression that is most used and accepted to label this theoretical framework and phenomenon has been *cross-linguistic influence* (CLI) (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Paradowski, 2007); due to the fact that it not only includes the traditional definitions of interference\(^8\) and transfer\(^9\), but it also embraces concepts related to language contact and interaction, such as the rate at which a second language is learned, and the avoidance of, for example, marked forms (Kellerman & Sharwood Smith, 1986), which for the purposes of this study is the Spanish subjunctive mood, which is marked in Spanish because is less generally used when compared to the indicative mood.

Considering and accepting any type of crosslinguistic influence or transfer between any two languages implies anticipating and expecting that these languages are permeable and that they will permit changes influenced by the language(s) with which they are in contact (Silva-

---

\(^8\) Interference “was seen as the cause of what appeared to be unsuccessful learning and served as the basis for predictions of learning problems” (p. 11, Meisel, 1983).

\(^9\) “Kellerman (1979) stated, ‘transfer can be understood as a psychological process whereby the learner, consciously or not, incorporates native language features into his target language production’ (in p. 14, Meisel, 1983). Selinker (1992) and Jarvis & Odlin (2000) observed that the term “language transfer” encompasses a “wide range of phenomena” (p. 537, Jarvis & Odlin, 2000).
Corvalán, 1986). However, it is important to weigh in other elements such as the fact that it is possible that cross-linguistic influence or transfer does not happen fortuitously, but that instead the language user possesses a key role in deciding if transfer is possible or not at the productive as well as at the receptive levels (Kellerman, 1995, 1983, 1979), and that elements such as: cognitive, social, intralinguistic, and interlinguistic factors (Silva-Corvalán, 1986) can transpire independently or in conjunction with each other, have been proven to either motivate or constrain linguistic changes amongst HLSs (Silva-Corvalán, 1986, p. 396). One of the hypotheses in this study was that HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish would be influenced by their dominant language (English) through simplification. In other words, it was expected that there would be a syntactic crosslinguistic influence or transfer from English to Spanish although the level of consciousness involved in the process was not investigated.

As a theoretical framework, CLI has been used extensively in studies regarding the acquisition of second or third languages and in studying fluent bilinguals. Some aspects of the phenomenon of CLI that have been investigated and that pertain directly to this study are: linguistic simplification (Martínez Mira, 2009; Hislope, 2005; Ocampo, 1990; Silva-Corvalán, 1994a, 1994, 1991, 1986), linguistic economy (Guijarro-Fuentes & Marinis, 2009), instances of L2 deficiencies that lead language users to implement elements from their first language (Kellerman, 1979), linguistic innovations that transpire amongst L2/FL learners which result “in varying degrees [of] transfer from [the] L2” (Boyd & Andersson, 1991, p. 33), and L2 pragmatic transfer (Cook, 2000).

In summary, CLI was chosen as the theoretical framework for this study because it has proven useful when studying phenomena that were expected to transpire in the present study
mainly among HLSs, namely: linguistic simplification, linguistic economy, linguistic innovations, and pragmatic transfer.

In the past 60 years this theoretical framework has undergone changes. In the 1950s and 1960s researchers such as Lado (1957) and Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin (1965) explained crosslinguistic influence or transfer as being determined by the distance between the speakers’ L1 and L2. They suggested that the more different the bilingual’s languages were the higher the likelihood of cross-linguistic influence between the languages. Later studies and current theory indicate the exact opposite, i.e., it suggests that in bilingual contexts the closer the language systems are to each other, the higher the likelihood of influence, interference, and transfer (Fairclough, 2005; Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998; Kellerman, 1995; Siegel, 1992; Van den Hoogen & Kuijper, 1989; Anderson, 1983).

In the late 70s Kellerman (1979) defined transfer in two ways: positive and negative (see also Kecskes & Papp, 2000b; Jarvis & Odlin, 2000; Kellerman, 1995; Meisel, 1983). Positive transfer transpired when a bilingual or an L2/FL learner made an assumption about the language being learned based on linguistic system of the speaker’s L1 or dominant language that was congruent with the language being learned making for a positive or satisfactory transfer. For instance, if an HLS were to use the subjunctive mood appropriately based on English syntax, the transfer would be positive. A negative transfer, on the other hand, implied that the speaker’s assumption about the language being learned did not match the linguistic system being learned. An example of negative transfer would be if HLSs, due to the syntax of their dominant language were to employ the indicative mood where the subjunctive was needed in Spanish. Kecskes and Papp (2000a) suggest that negative transfer transpires only at the elementary level of language development and acquisition and that it demonstrates “lack of some knowledge” (p. xv) mainly
at the pragmatic and syntactic levels rather than at the semantic or lexical levels. They also argue that as the individual’s linguistic knowledge expands, the transfer usually becomes positive (p. xv; see also Kellerman, 1979), especially when the speaker’s interacting languages “differ from each other in configuration” (Kecskes & Papp, 2000b, p. 16). In the present study it was expected to find instances of negative transfer based on the HLS participants’ dominant language system in participants whose heritage language level was very basic. It was also speculated that this negative could be working in tandem with two elements: 1) a transfer developed as a conscious tool in order to optimize communication during the process of discovering and testing the structure of their heritage language (Meisel, 1983); and 2) a transfer used as an unconscious resource incorporated spontaneously by the HLS when employing elements of their dominant language into the heritage language production.

In the 80s, Silva-Corvalán (1986) argued that crosslinguistic influence or transfer could be permanent or temporary and that it could “occur at any level of the linguistic system (phonological, morphological, lexical, syntactic, or semantic)” (p. 587; see also Kecskes & Papp, 2000a). She added that “transfer and convergence appear to operate at more ‘superficial’ and idiosyncratic levels, such as preferential use of certain forms in contexts where the more or less corresponding English form would also be preferred” (p. 167; see also Kecskes & Papp, 2000a, 2000c). Preferential use of the indicative mood where the Spanish subjunctive would have been used by monolingual speakers but indicative would have been preferred in the English system was also expected in HLS production.

---

10 Kecskes & Papp (2000) call this phenomenon “transfer as a linguistic systems phenomenon” and characterize it by bidirectional influence among language systems in terms of for example, “sound pattern, lexical item, or structure” (p. xvi).

11 Kecskes & Papp (2000) refer to this phenomenon as “Transfer as a CUCB [common underlying conceptual base] phenomenon” and define it as the moment when the “knowledge or skills acquired through one language system become ready to be used through the other language channel(s)” (p. xvi, and p. 54).
Thomason and Kaufmann (1988) employed concepts such as “borrowing transfer” and “substratum transfer” (p. 35) to suggest a bidirectional crosslinguistic influence or transfer. They defined *borrowing transfer* as the influence of the L2 on the L1, and *substratum transfer* as the influence of the L1 on the L2 (see also Odlin, 1989). Since most of the HLSs\(^\text{12}\) who participated in this study considered Spanish their L1 because it was the language they learned first and spoke at home and in the community until they were immersed in their L2 (English) at school, one objective of this study was to remain alert for examples of what Thomason and Kaufmann (1988) termed borrowing transfer (i.e., the influence of the dominant language system on the L1) but transpiring in a unidirectional way, specifically from English to Spanish in HLSs, which coincides with Odlin’s (1989) perspective of CLI being a unidirectional phenomenon. The concept of CLI being a unidirectional phenomenon has been met with rejection by Cook (2000, 1992), and other researchers (Wolff & Ventura, 2009; Bernardini & Schlyter, 2004; Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002; Heredia & Altarriba, 2001; Kecskes & Papp, 2000c; Cook, 1992). They argue that Odlin’s (1989) definition of CLI is inaccurate because it is based on unidirectional rather than bidirectional phenomena, which is what is observed among most bilingual and multilingual individuals. Kecskes and Papp (2000b, 2000c) among other researchers (Tremblay, 2006; Cenoz, 2003, 2001), stress the importance of documenting CLI as a bidirectional phenomenon between two languages for two reasons: 1) it increases the possibilities of dealing with the influence that the two or more languages can have on each other; and 2) it aids in explicating and comprehending the phenomenon. Even though I agree with the validity of the concept of bidirectional transfer, in this study the only transfer considered as a possible explanation for HLSs’ Spanish subjunctive mood simplification or erosion was the unidirectional English to Spanish mood system influence. It was expected that this unidirectional transfer would manifest

\(^{12}\) Based on the dataset from the survey.
itself through a subtle encroachment of the HLSs dominant language (English) on their less
 dominant language (Spanish) at the semantic and syntactic levels (Marian & Kaushanskaya,
2007; Odlin, 1989).

In the 90s, Silva-Corvalán (1994) discussed the term transfer describing it as a
“controversial notion” (p. 4; see also Silva-Corvalán, 1995). She classified the term into four
different categories. The first two categories involve “direct transfer” (p. 4) and the last two
“indirect transfer” (p. 4). According to Silva-Corvalán (1994), direct transfer transpires among
bilinguals in two cases: 1) when a form in one language is replaced with a form from the other,
or when a form – that is absent in one language – is incorporated from the other (p. 4), such as
incorporating the word *lonche* in Spanish “to refer to a noon meal” (p. 4), and 2) when there are
cases of extension or reduction of the meaning of forms in one language due to the influence of
the other language “Example: *registrarse* incorporates the meaning of *to register* (in school),
thus making obsolete the Spanish words *matricularse/inscribirse* ‘to register in a school/for a
course’” (p. 4). On the other hand, indirect transfer takes place when: 3) bilinguals utilize a form
in their L2 more often than monolinguals do as a result of the morphology of their L1 which
employs it either preferentially or categorically (p. 4) citing as an example the more frequent use
of the present progressive by Puerto Rican bilinguals as compared to monolinguals, or when 4)
the omission or loss of a form that does not have an equivalent form or category in the other
language’s system in one of the bilingual’s languages is observed (p. 4), such as is “the loss of
adjective gender marking in some varieties of Los Angeles Spanish” influenced by the lack of
adjective gender marking in English (Silva-Corvalán, 1994, p. 4)

Although Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) examples deal with lexical transfer such as “*lonche* is
incorporated to refer to a noon meal” (p. 4), this first case of direct transfer was expected to
transpire in the subjunctive use of HLSs, for example, it was anticipated that the indicative would creep in expressions where monolingual Spanish speakers would choose the subjunctive. Additionally, based on prior studies dealing with the state of the subjunctive among HLSs, Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) second case of indirect transfer in which categories are lost due to the lack of a parallel category or form in the other language was also expected to be found in HLSs’ language production. Erosion, omission, and even complete avoidance of the subjunctive were expected in the language use of HLSs in this study.

In the last decade, the definition of CLI has expanded. Jarvis and Odlin (2000) have proposed that CLI could also manifest itself as a result of linguistic retentions from another language known by the language learner in which a hybrid is form created. They explain that “[w]henever challenges of using or understanding a second language arise, learners may retain something from the L1 or some other language to aid in coping with the new challenges” (p. 537). They also highlight that retention can be applied to situations of positive as well as negative transfer, and clarify that the term “retention” is not meant to be understood as a “falling back” on the L1 or other known language but rather as the creation of a hybrid form that shows more than one language combination or what they call language “blending” (p. 537).

Marian and Kaushanskaya (2007) discussed semantic and syntactic transfer (p. 375) in a way that could also be valid for structure and grammar. They write about the “use of a word or phrase in the target language… consistent with [the semantic content or the syntactic structure] of the non-target language, [but that do not] obey the conventional… rules for a given context in the target language” (p. 375; see also Silva-Corvalán, 1994). Marian and Kaushanskaya present the following examples of syntactic transfer “the use of the word table in ‘I was hungry and was happy to see the table’ was coded as a semantic transfer because in Russian, the word table (stol)
can mean either the actual table or the food on the table” (p. 375). Instances of this type of transfer were expected among HLSs’ in subjunctive use in mandatory as well as optional contexts. For example, based on prior studies, it was hypothesized that HLSs’ subjunctive would be almost obliterated and that the indicative mood would be the norm among HLSs regardless of what they were trying to convey in their message.

Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) add to the discussion on crosslinguistic influence or transfer by explaining that it is possible for this phenomenon to transpire in forward as well as backward motions across the languages employed by the multi/bilingual language user. In other words, the L1 can potentially influence the bilingual’s L2 (forward transfer); and the L2 can also influence the bilingual’s L1 (backward or reverse transfer). With regard to syntactic transfer they explain that learning a second language can cause a person to do two things, either “become more tolerant of ungrammatical constructions in the L1” or “reject L1 sentences that are considered perfectly grammatical by monolingual native speakers.” (p. 97). It was expected, therefore, that the English system would influence the way HLSs employed the subjunctive mood in Spanish by either avoiding uses that would have been accepted by monolingual native Spanish speakers, or by using ungrammatical forms that native speakers would not accept.

In their study Guijarro-Fuentes and Marinis (2009) present empirical data supporting language transfer. They support current theory by proposing that overlapping language systems at the “surface level” (p. 81) interfere (as they called it) with each other. For instance, in their study, the acquisition and use of the personal a in Spanish proved more challenging to Catalan-Spanish bilinguals than to Spanish-English bilinguals. Additionally, they found that among “English-Spanish bilinguals, the language that has the most economical option (i.e., English) exerts some kind of influence” (p. 90) in the grammar of the other language due the linguistic
tendency (across languages) to favor simpler and more economic language forms. The implications of latter finding was of particular interest in the present study because if the tendency to implement the most economical grammatical option were to be validated in the present study, the data analysis would shed light on a reduction and simplification of the Spanish subjunctive use amongst HLSs.

Next, the semantically-syntactically based approach to Spanish mood (Terrell & Hooper, 1974), and the pragmatic approach to Spanish mood (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004; Haverkate, 2002; Guitart, 1995) are presented to explain the linguistic and pragmatic contexts that typically trigger the use of subjunctive in Spanish. In the present study, the three contexts in which the subjunctive use was studied were volition, lack of existence, and impersonal expressions.

**Semantically-Syntactically and Pragmatically Based Approaches to Spanish Mood**

Whitley (2002) argues that: “the most important fact to emerge from scholarly debates on the subjunctive is that mood selection in Spanish has less to do with automatic triggers [i.e., a particular antecedent] than with the speaker’s attitude toward a proposition he/she places in a clause… native speakers actively exploit the contrast in order to convey different meanings” (p. 134).

Early approaches had been to either study the use of the subjunctive mood among Spanish monolinguals in a semantic or in a syntactic way. The syntactic approach (supported by structuralists and transformationalists) is still often employed to guide Spanish textbook explanations and instruction of subjunctive mood in the U.S. (Guitart, 1995; Terrell & Hooper, 1974). It explains the use of subjunctive mood in correlation to, and as a consequence of, certain antecedents that in Spanish trigger the use of the subjunctive (Bergen, 197813; Solé & Solé,

---

13 More modern reference texts on Spanish grammar (such as Butt & Benjamin, 1988; Batchelor & Pountain, 2005) also offer the antecedent-based approach as a way to explain the mood system in Spanish.

One of the first attempts to clarify and classify the indicative/subjunctive mood use by Spanish monolinguals came from Keniston (1937). He explained that the Spanish subjunctive mood is used by monolinguals when the intention of the speaker was to approach the action or state being presented not as a fact or reality but as an assumption. Ramsey (1956) classified the use of the subjunctive mood in Spanish as governed and determined by a series of 25 possible matrices such as: commands, demands, requests, proposals, suggestions, desire, emotions, feelings, and impersonal expressions. He explained that if any of these matrices appeared in a Spanish independent clause or antecedent, the mood needed in the complement or dependent clause would be the subjunctive. Gili y Gaya (1961/1973) indicated that in Spanish noun clauses the subjunctive is employed in two different ways: a) first, when the antecedent presents an unreal, unknown or doubtful entity (event, situation, person), such as an event that has not taken place yet, or something that is still pending\textsuperscript{14} – as opposed to the indicative which is employed to express reality and factual information; and b) second, a case considered “special” by Gili y Gaya (1961/1973) takes place when the antecedent triggers an emotional reaction (regardless of whether the entity is real or unreal because, as he explains it, emotions are internal to each individual and therefore unreal)\textsuperscript{15}. Bull (1972, 1965) also attempted to catalog the use of the subjunctive by establishing three categories for the mandatory implementation of the Spanish subjunctive mood. The first category included instances in which the speakers state emotional reactions. This classification was accompanied by a caveat that warned language users of the existence of commonly used antecedents that could trigger either the subjunctive or the

\textsuperscript{14} Verb such as dudar (to doubt) and desear (to desire or wish) fall under Gili y Gaya’s (1973) first category (p. 131).

\textsuperscript{15} Verbs such as temer (to fear), alegrarse de (to be happy about); and ser sorprendente (to be surprising) fit Gili y Gaya (1973)’s second category (p. 137).
indicative moods in the dependent clause in Spanish. The explanation for this potential variability was based on what the speaker intended to express. For example, if a speaker were to express an emotional reaction (psychological response (12) below) such as fear, the speaker would use the subjunctive. But if the speaker made a reasonable prediction (as in example (13) below) then the same verb that triggered the subjunctive mood in example (12), would require the use of the indicative in example (13):

(12)  Temo que Esteban llegue tarde  
I fear Esteban will arrive [SUBJ] late

(13)  Temo que Esteban ha llegado  
I am afraid he has arrived [IND] late

Following Bull’s (1972, 1965) analysis, statement (13) with the verb temer ‘to fear/to be afraid’ as the antecedent, triggers the indicative instead of the subjunctive because the speaker is expressing an assumption that someone has arrived late. Since (13) does not present an instance of psychological response, the employment of the subjunctive would prove ungrammatical because the speaker is not expressing fear or another psychological or emotional reaction to a situation. In other words, example (13) would allow for a matrix that implies a higher level of commitment such as the verb creer ‘to believe’ to relay a similar message. For example, the speaker could have said:

(14)  Creo que Esteban ha llegado  
I believe he has arrived [IND]

The difference between (13) and (14) is that the latter demonstrates a higher level of commitment on the part of the speaker with regard the conveyed message. What (13) and (14) have in common is that the speaker in both instances believes in the truth value (veracity) of the statements. Bull’s (1972, 1965) first category seems to be in disagreement with Gili y Gaya’s (1961/1973) second category (emotional reactions) which is categorically described by Gili y
Gaya as an instance of subjunctive trigger. Bull’s (1972, 1965) examples (12) and (13) demonstrate and exemplify this disagreement evincing that the blanket statement presented by Gili y Gaya (1961/1973) could be considered inaccurate depending on what the language user interprets as “emotional reactions.” Bull’s (1972, 1965) second category states that when the antecedent has not been experienced by the speaker, or when the antecedent is anticipated but uncertain, yet to be encountered or unproven from the point of view of the speaker, the subjunctive mood will be employed. The following examples by Bull illustrate this second category:

A. **Affirmative statement** known to the speaker:
   
   (15a) **Sé que saldrá**  
   I know she will leave [IND]
   vs.

   **Doubtful statement** not yet experienced by the speaker:
   
   (15b) **Dudo que salga**  
   I doubt she will leave [SUBJ]

B. **Known fact/entity:**
   
   (16a) **Busco al gato que no tiene pulgas**  
   I am looking for a cat with no fleas [IND]
   vs.

   **Expression of lack of existence:**
   
   (16b) **Busco un gato que no tenga pulgas**  
   I am looking for a cat with no fleas [SUBJ]

C. **Known fact:**
   
   (17a) **Vamos después de que regresan**  
   We will go after they return [IND]
   vs.

   **Pending fact:**
   
   (17b) **Vamos después de que regresan**  
   We will go after they return [SUBJ] – if they ever do return
Based on Bull’s (1972, 1965) classification, the indicative mood is used in example (15a) because the message has been experienced and it is known to the speaker. The subjunctive mood is employed in (15b) because the speaker doubts it, or is uncertain about the event (which Bull would categorize as “not yet experienced by the speaker”). In example (16a) the indicative mood is employed to stress the fact that the cat does not have fleas; where in (16b) the subjunctive mood is used because the fact that the cat is flea-free is still unknown to the speaker (although that is the characteristic the speaker looks for in the cat). Example (17a) expresses an assertion as a known fact; and (17b) expresses a pending action (i.e., something that has not happened yet and therefore has not been experienced by the speaker). In (17a) the fact that it is asserted that the speakers’ actions (to go somewhere) are determined by the actions of a third party (to arrive) requires the use of the indicative mood. In (17b) the use of the subjunctive mood indicates that the speakers will go after the third party arrives (if it ever does). Consequently, by using the subjunctive mood in Spanish, the message expressed in (17b) presents a hypothetical situation (i.e., the possibility that the arrival may never happen). Bull’s (1972, 1965) final category requires the existence of two elements: an attempt to influence behavior and a matrix that creates an environment where events can be subjoined in a causal manner (cause/effect). Bull’s examples in (18) and (19) below, illustrate his third and final category contrasting the use of the indicative mood in a simple cause/effect statement (18) and the need to use the subjunctive mood in a subjoined cause/effect statement (19):

**Cause-effect:**

(18)  
*Se abre el grifo y sale el agua*  
The faucet is opened and water comes out [IND]
Subjoined cause/effect:

(19)  *Se abre el grifo para que salga el agua*
The faucet is opened so water comes out [SUBJ]

Example (18) contains two independent noun phrases (NPs), *se abre el grifo* and *sale el agua*; albeit being combined in one sentence they do not depend on each other for independent meaning. In (19) on the other hand, the complement (*para que salga el agua*) depends on the antecedent (*se abre el grifo*), i.e., the complement it does not have an independent meaning (without the information presented in the antecedent).

Other scholars such as Bolinger (1974), Goldin (1974), and Lozano (1972) have also explained and classified the use of subjunctive mood in Spanish by monolinguals and its contrast with the indicative mood; however, their classifications were not complete because they either dealt with the semantic or the syntactic aspects of the subjunctive mood.

**The Semantic-syntactic Approach or Antecedent Based Approach (ABA)**

Terrell and Hooper\(^\text{16}\) (1974) and Terrell (1976) broke new ground in presenting a combined syntactically/semantically based analysis of mood choice in Spanish. They stressed the importance of the speaker’s intended message as the main determinant of mood choice in Spanish. In the semantic-syntactic approach (Mejías-Bikandi, 1994; Lunn, 1989a, 1989b; Lavandera, 1984, 1983), also known as antecedent based approach or ABA (Guitart, 1995), Terrell & Hooper (1974) rejected prior analyses of Spanish mood. They argued that these analyses rendered the Spanish subjunctive mood void of independent meaning, lacking in “real semantic function” (p. 484), and completely dependent upon the independent clause which

\(^{16}\) Note that just because Terrell and Hooper (1974) did not call their approach “pragmatic” it does not mean that their analysis was not pragmatic (the term was very new in the 70s) that is why their approach was called “semantic” even though they were talking about speaker’s intended meaning i.e., pragmatic meaning.
would force the subjunctive to appear only on the basis of co-occurring relationships\(^\text{17}\).

Although a syntactic approach might be helpful at some pedagogical level, Terrell and Hooper (1974) explained that it is incomplete because it does not reflect the way Spanish native speakers use the language. Terrell and Hooper (1974) proposed a syntactically and semantically based approach that regards mood choice as being based on the speaker’s attitudes, the truth of the proposition from the speaker’s point of view, and the speaker’s level of commitment to the statement being expressed, instead of basing it solely on a subjunctive triggering or mandating matrix; in other words, the subjunctive mood acquires a semantic function within the utterance. This function is determined by the speaker’s choice of a certain syntactic construction to convey with exactitude the desired meaning. As a consequence, it is the responsibility of the interlocutors to understand the intended meaning through the consideration of the context, as well as the statements’ semantic and syntax of the whole phrase or utterance instead of individual trigger or matrix verbs.

As noted earlier, the Spanish indicative mood is associated with assertion and the subjunctive with non-assertion (Terrell & Hooper, 1974, p. 487; see also Lunn, 1989a; Rivero, 1971). Direct commands or imperatives such as example (20):

\[(20) \quad \text{¡Venga!} \]
\[ \text{Come!} \]

represent neither mood as this paradigm is a combination of elements from both moods.

However, the strength and directness of example (20) can be hedged by embedding it in clauses of influence of different degrees expressing volition *querer* ‘to want’ as in example (21):

\[(21) \quad \text{Quiero que venga} \]
\[ \text{I want you to come [SUBJ]} \]

\(^\text{17}\) Terrell & Hooper (1974) explains it as follows: “the choice of mood is determined automatically by the type of phrase found in the matrix… the mood of the embedded verb is merely a morphological reflex of the class of the matrix phrase” (p. 485).
suasion esperar ‘to hope’ as in (22):

(22) \( \text{Espero que venga} \)
I hope you come [SUBJ]

or direct influence aconsejar ‘to give advice’ as in (23):

(23) \( \text{Le aconsejo que venga} \)
I advice that you come [SUBJ]

which in Spanish require the use of the subjunctive mood, because the statements cannot be asserted (Terrell & Hooper, 1974). The possibility to manipulate the language’s syntactic system makes is feasible for speakers to express different degrees of force.

Additionally, Terrell and Hooper’s (1974) analysis of Spanish mood includes expressing comments and doubts because they are also determined by the speaker’s attitude and level of commitment or assertion towards the utterances/statements. With regard to comments, in order for speakers to be able to comment on something, they have to presuppose that the proposition is a true statement; this allows for comments to be made but does not imply that the speaker is expressing an assertion. As a consequence, comments trigger the subjunctive mood in Spanish. Some examples of comments are alegrarse ‘to be happy about something’, and ser una lástima ‘that something is a pity’. Comments are different in nature from doubts because when expressing the latter (i.e., doubts and uncertainty) the speaker denies an assertion, which leads native Spanish speakers to use the subjunctive mood. In summary, according to Terrell and Hooper (1974) Spanish native speakers use the Spanish indicative mood when they assert and presuppose the affirmative truth value of a statement and the subjunctive mood when the truth value is not asserted or is denied.

According to Terrell and Hooper (1974), mood choice modify the meaning of utterances; which means that the matrix in the independent clause does not guide the implementation of the
subjunctive in the dependent clause; instead, the independent clause needs to match the meaning of the complement or dependent clause (p. 490) in order to make the whole utterance meaningful. For instance, if an assertion (24) is doubted, doubting the truth of this proposition will be expressed using the subjunctive (25):

(24) \textit{Juan \textit{viene} \textit{mañana}}
Juan comes [IND] tomorrow

(25) \textit{Dudo que Juan \textit{venga} \textit{mañana}}
I doubt that Juan will come [SUBJ] tomorrow

It can also be argued that in expressing doubt as in (25), the speaker is also expressing a subjective comment which would also require the implementation of the subjunctive mood in Spanish. By the same token, a doubt (26) can be modified by using the indicative mood so that the interlocutor interprets it as an assertion (i.e., the negation of the original doubt) (27):

(26) \textit{Dudo que Consuelo \textit{sea} una artista famosa}
I doubt Consuelo is [SUBJ] a famous artist

(27) \textit{No dudo que Consuelo \textit{es} una artista famosa}
I have no doubt Consuelo is [IND] a famous artist

Last but not least, even when assertions and non-assertions are qualified by insistence or urgency they retain their mood choice. For example, Terrell and Hooper (1974) present the following examples (p. 491):

\textbf{Imperative:}

(28a) \textit{Insisto en que no retiren las tropas}
I insist on their not withdrawing [SUBJ] the troops

\textbf{Assertion:}

(28b) \textit{Insisto en que no retiran las tropas}
I insist that they are not withdrawing [IND] troops

Although Terrell and Hooper’s (1974) approach advanced the classification and study of the Spanish moods, their approach has been questioned by later researchers (Butt & Benjamin,
who contend that Terrell and Hooper’s (1974) Spanish mood analysis remains tied to the classification pattern that preceded them, connecting mood choice to a limited number of principles such as the use of the subjunctive in complement clauses in dubitative, affective, and volitional constructions. For instance, Guitart (1982) disagreed with Terrell and Hooper’s mood classification arguing that mood varies not only based on the speaker’s intentions, but also on whether the information in the embedded clause of an affective construction is shared by the interlocutor. He asserted that “[d]ifferences in mood transmit differences in meaning” (p. 385). Butt and Benjamin (2004) also questioned Terrell and Hooper’s classification, explaining that mood can vary based on the speakers’ beliefs about the idea being expressed in, for example, dubitative constructions. Despite such criticism, however, the traditional syntactic/semantic approach is still widely used in linguistics circles concomitantly with more recent pragmatic analyses of Spanish mood such as the three presented next.

Pragmatic Approaches

Three schools of pragmatic analysis of the subjunctive in Spanish are: the NP-based, class/member analysis of mood choice (Guitart, 1995); an analysis dealing with relative/adjective clauses (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004); and another dealing with nominal/noun clauses (Haverkate, 2002).

Guitart’s (1995) NP-based, class/member analysis of mood for relative/adjective clauses (from now on the NP-based analysis) classifies the employment of the Spanish subjunctive mood as related to the intentions of the speaker when expressing certain statements. Guitart’s approach adds a quality of independent meaning to the subjunctive mood without disregarding the role of context or of the independent clause. In other words, the NP-based analysis assigns the Spanish
subjunctive mood an ability to have an independent meaning (Guitart, 1995). A major discrepancy between the NP-based analysis and the ABA approach is that in the latter the Spanish subjunctive mood is interpreted as adding information to the utterance and in the NP-based analysis the subjunctive mood is seen as independently creating new meaning. In the NP-based analysis Guitart (1995) rejects “the antecedent as the basis of analysis, and the dichotomies known-unknown, existent-nonexistent, and experienced/non-experienced as the determinants of mood choice in Spanish relative clauses” (p. 386). Instead, the NP-based analysis proposes a framework that describes “mood choice in relative clauses in terms of the entire noun phrase in which the clause is embedded and of which the antecedent is an integral part” (p. 386). In the NP-based approach the antecedent or independent clause is “seen as the nominal element that the clause modifies as an adjective…” (p. 386), and the employment of the Spanish mood system is dependent upon speaker’s intention. According to Guitart’s (1995) analysis, speakers will use the indicative mood under two circumstances: 1) if they assert that the noun phrase included in their statement is a part or is NOT a part of the world or universe (as seen by the speaker), or 2) if the world/universe contains members of the class defined by the noun phrase. If on the other hand, the speaker asserts that the world/universe contains no members or hardly any members (to use his terminology) of the noun phrase; or if the speaker inquires about the world/universe containing any members of such a class, then the subjunctive is employed\(^{18}\).

Discrepancies between Guitart’s (1995) Analysis and Traditional Approaches

Guitart’s (1995) criticism of traditional approaches is based on what he deems an “inadequate” (p. 387) and “incorrect” (p. 388) way of classifying the use of the Spanish

---

\(^{18}\) Guitart (1995) writes: “It should be added that when a question constitutes an attempt to verify if indeed L contains member of the class defined by the clause, the indicative is used, as in (30): (30) Ah, ¿así que hay computadoras que pueden traducir sin errores? [IND] ‘Oh, so there are computers that can translate without error?’” (p. 396).
subjunctive mood among Spanish native speakers. The most salient discrepancy between the NP-based analysis and the traditional explanations for mood choice in relative clauses is that in traditional analyses the Spanish subjunctive mood is interpreted as depending upon the antecedent, whereas in Guitart’s analysis the subjunctive mood is seen as independently creating new meaning, while antecedent and context are still considered. Two examples presented by Guitart (1995) in this regard are the following: Haré lo que quieres [IND] ‘I will do what you want’ and Haré lo que quieras [SUBJ] ‘I will do whatever you want.’ (p. 393). In the first example by use of the indicative mood the speaker expresses knowledge of what the interlocutor wants. However, in using subjunctive in the second example the message expressed is that the speaker is unaware of what the interlocutor wants; therefore, the mood chosen by the speaker conveyed one or the other meaning to the listener who is responsible for interpreting what is being uttered for a felicitous communication to transpire. Consequently, from a pedagogical perspective, traditional approaches “mislead students into thinking that mood selection is dictated by the type of main verb or conjunction” (Whitley, 2002, p. 127) which is not necessarily correct since in some contexts (as seen in Guitart’s examples above), and depending on the intended meaning of the language user, the subjunctive mood might not be necessary or even desired, making its employment optional or incorrect. For instance, L1 English learners of Spanish are taught that in Spanish, matrices of influence such as ordenar and demandar (both meaning ‘to demand’) trigger the subjunctive mood when a change of subject is present –as is the case of somebody demanding that someone else do something. From a pragmatic approach this rule is not only useless but incorrect because native Spanish speakers do not always follow it when using verbs of influence (Whitley, 2002). Whitley (2002) presents two examples (29a) and (29b) in which the verb to demand is employed in Spanish with the subjunctive (29a) and with
the indicative (29b). He assures that both examples would be judged as acceptable and correct by native Spanish speakers (Whitley, 2002, p. 127):

(29a) Ordenó que hicieran la cola
He demanded that they stand [SUBJ] in line

(29b) Ordenó que tenían que hacer la cola
He demanded that they had to stand [IND] in line

Examples (29a) and (29b) illustrate that rules presented by the traditional approaches might be useful and even preferred at a beginners’ level (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004). However, they quickly become useless and even confusing when teaching more advanced Spanish students because these rules lack flexibility, and the ability to explain the pragmatic nuances of the subjunctive use in Spanish. Furthermore, examples (29a) and (29b) show instances that would support Guitart’s (1995) proposal which is that mood choice does not depend upon the antecedent (i.e., it is not syntactically determined by a matrix in the independent clause), but that mood aids the speaker and the interlocutor in at least two ways:

a) First it aids speakers in stating exactly what they means by providing them with a pragmatic gamut of degrees of expression; and

b) Secondly, it directs the interlocutor’s interpretation of the utterance so as to achieve a satisfactory/felicitous communication. As Lavandera (1983) explains, mood choice is one way of alerting interlocutors on how to interpret the messages received.

Pragmatic Approach for Relative/Adjective Clauses (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004)

In a second pragmatic approach, Ahern and Leonetti (2004), based on relevance theory, also question Terrell and Hooper’s (1974) classification of mood choice in Spanish. In their analysis dealing with relative/adjective clauses they argue that “procedural expressions” (p. 36)
such as mood choice\textsuperscript{19} determine the message of the utterance, and not the matrix in the independent clause. They explain that: “...the subjunctive is not merely a formal reflection of the sentential contexts in which it appears,...[but that] its presence can actively condition the context of interpretation – understood as the set of assumptions used to interpret an utterance” (p. 39). Consequently, mood choice facilitates interlocutors’ interpretation of the messages being received (Lavandera, 1983). Mood directs the meaning of the statement being presented and thus guides interlocutors to “manipulate the conceptual representations [in order] to access the adequate contextual assumptions [so they can] construct the intended interpretation” (p. 36, Ahern and Leonetti, 2004). In other words, Ahern and Leonetti (2004) propose that when sentential context is not enough to satisfy the conditions for the subjunctive to be implemented in dependent clauses, the choice of this mood activates in the interlocutor’s brain the needed assumptions to comprehend the message intended by the speaker. To illustrate the power of the mood choices, Ahern and Leonetti (2004) present examples of what they have termed “double-mood selection” (p. 42) which is characterized by syntactically identical instances in which monolinguals use and consider grammatically acceptable either the indicative or the subjunctive mood in Spanish. With regard to interlocutors, in cases of double-mood selection they must apply (either consciously or unconsciously) a skill termed “accommodation” (Ahern and Leonetti, 2004, pp. 42-44), which consists of an adjustment performed by the hearer in order to felicitously interpret the message received (Lavandera, 1983).

Examples (30a) and (30b) presented by Ahern and Leonetti (2004, p. 38), exemplify instances of double-mood selection:

\begin{quote}
(30a) \textit{Le regalamos un libro que lo entretuvo} \\
To-him/her we-gave a book that her/him entertained [IND]
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{19} Other procedural expressions presented by Ahern & Leonetti (2004) are: tense, focus, definite determiners, and discourse markers (p. 40).
(30b)  *Le regalamos un libro que lo entretuviera*
To-him/her we-gave a book that her/him entertained [SUBJ]

These examples show that through the use of mood it is possible to express and interpret the intention of messages being communicated by considering context as well as message.

Ahern and Leonetti (2004) also present cases in which the subjunctive is the only mood expected and employed by native Spanish speakers and in which a double-mood selection is unacceptable. For instance, when native Spanish speakers express a need or a desire for something they do not have and that might not even exist in the world as they know it a message with an “opaque context” (p. 39) is created. In these cases, implementation of the subjunctive is expected. In these instances mood choice is not the only element that aids the listener in interpreting the message in a felicitous manner, the presence of a contextual opacity in the statement serves as additional help. In order to illustrate a message with an opaque context Ahern and Leonetti (2004) present the following example (p. 39):

(31)  *Por fin / Finalmente* leío un libro en el que se analice el modo...
Finally I read a book in the which CL analyse [SUBJ] the mood...

and explain that the subjunctive mood is employed in such cases because the interpretation of the relative clause is one of non-asserted information.

**Pragmatic Approach for Noun Clauses (Haverkate, 2002)**

In a third pragmatic approach, Haverkate (2002) proposes a very thorough analysis of mood choice in nominal/noun clauses that rejects the more commonly or traditionally accepted approaches (i.e., the syntactic or semantic approaches and ABA). He considers them: 1) “inaccurate” (pp. 50-1) since the features responsible for mood choice in Spanish are not clearly and accurately described; 2) “incomplete” (pp. 50-1) due to the fact that in subjunctive

\[\text{20 For instance, the speaker is not sure if the individual needed to fill a position is available for the job being offered, or if this person even exists.}\]
classification a number of predicates are overlooked or not taken into consideration; and 3) “unilateral” (pp. 50-1) because in the traditional classification only verbs governing the subjunctive use are presented but not those needed to trigger the indicative mood (see also Guitart, 1995).

The framework proposed by Haverkate (2002) “derives from the assumption that [nominal] predicates… share the property of providing information on the set of processes that typify intentional human behavior” (p. 51). From a psychological stance this “intentional human behavior” means thoughts, feelings, and will; and from a linguistic perspective, it involves embedding predicates that fall into one of three possible categories (which in chronological order of acquisition – according to Haverkate, 2002) are the following:

1) Acquisition of knowledge predicates – which describe categories involved in the processing of perceptual and conceptual information;

2a) Cognitive predicates, which are divided into three sub-classes:
   a) Epistemic (saber ‘to know’);
   b) Doxastic (creer ‘to believe’); and
   c) Dubitative (dudar ‘to doubt’); and

2b) Evaluative predicates, which express an assessment of stored information, divided into two sub-categories:
   a) Rational – with predicates such as: ser lógico (‘to be logical’); ser usual (‘to be usual’), and ser preciso (‘to be necessary’);
   b) Emotional – exemplified but predicates such as: gustar (‘to like’), irritar (‘to irritate’), and apreciar (‘to appreciate’ or ‘to perceive something’); and
c) Action predicates further sub-divided into three categories “involved in output of intentional behavior” (p. 52):

i. Causative acts (*causar* ‘to cause’);

ii. Mental acts (*deducir* ‘to deduce’); and

iii. Speech acts (*decir* ‘to say’)

Haverkate (2002) argues that his classification covers not only the entirety of clause-embedding predicates, but it also offers the possibility of making reliable predictions about the distribution of the indicative and subjunctive mood in Spanish complement clause (p. 52). In light of the present study, Haverkate’s (2002) classification of Spanish mood contributes to the understanding of mood choice in noun clauses by stressing the importance of the psychological element in language use and interpretation.

**Prior Studies on Subjunctive Use among HLSs in the U.S.**

Ocampo (1990) and Silva-Corvalán (1994a, 1994, 1991, 1986) wrote their studies based on samples of the same set of oral data originally gathered by Silva-Corvalán (1986) through recording of conversations made mainly between 1983 and 1985 (with some additional recordings performed during 1987-8). These data included information collected from 50 Mexicans in East Los Angeles 21 (Silva-Corvalán, 1986) representing three generations: Spanish monolinguals living in L.A. (1st generation), and Spanish HLSs who had learned Spanish at home with their families but were also immersed in English-dominant-environments outside of their homes (2nd and 3rd generations).

In her 1986 study, Silva-Corvalán used a sub-set sample of 14 participants, six from Group1 (monolinguals living in L.A.), four from Group2 (2nd generation HLSs), and four from

---

21 In addition to the oral data, Silva-Corvalán (1994) used two other forms of data gathering: “(a) fill-in-the-gap questionnaires to obtain supplementary information about the speakers’ use of various tenses, as well as of *ser* and *estar*; and (b) a set of questionnaires which explore speakers’ attitudes towards English and Spanish” (p. 15).
Group3 (3rd generation HLSs). With regard to the use of the subjunctive mood Silva-Corvalán (1986) found that some of the Group 3 participants proved unable to clearly express hypothetical situations or to state different degrees of assertiveness. In other words, 3rd generation HLSs participants had lost what she defined as “quantity of expression” (p. 406) when they avoided the use of the subjunctive mood in their oral expression. This avoidance created a “diminished range of possibilities as they speculate[d] about past or the non-past” (p. 406). Additionally, these 3rd generation HLSs were less able than the other two generations in her study to express hypothetical situations and differing levels of assertiveness: first, because 3rd generation HLSs lacked lexical choices that would allow them to express “the higher cognitive complexity of hypothetical texts as compared to narrative ones” (p. 406); and secondly, because they used the indicative mood almost exclusively, which led to a reduction of “stylistic choices” in ways that conveyed “a strong degree of assertiveness and predictive certainty, without differentiating between more or less possible matter in the hypothetical world created” (pp. 406-7).

Ocampo (1990), who sampled Silva-Corvalán’s (1986) data by choosing three participants22 from each generation (a total of nine participants), presented two different overall findings: 1) the first one regarding cases of optional use of the subjunctive, and 2) the second one presenting cases of mandatory uses. For the optional cases, Ocampo (1990) established that by the 3rd generation –who represented U.S. born HLSs– the employment of the subjunctive mood had been reduced considerably from the 1st generation who were Spanish native speakers. Whereas Group 1 employed the subjunctive (when needed) 79% of the time in optional situations, Group 3 employed it 22% of the time (Ocampo, 1990). These findings illustrate a dramatic decrease in the use of the subjunctive mood amongst 3rd generation participants when compared to G1 participants in optional cases. Regarding mandatory contexts such as those

---

22 Ocampo (1990) as mentioned before used Silva-Corvalán’s (1986) dataset in his study.
expressing volition involving two different entities, 3rd generation showed a much higher employment of the subjunctive mood in Spanish (62%) than they did in optional cases.

Based on these findings, Ocampo (1990) cautioned that if reduction and simplification trends continue as observed in the cases of optional employment of subjunctive, HLSs would eventually reach a complete loss of the subjunctive mood (p. 45). He argued that the reason why 3rd generation HLSs employed the subjunctive more consistently in categorical contexts was because it was easier to make mechanical associations (i.e., it just sounds correct), than to internalize and produce semantic associations according to intended message (p. 45); this argument had been previously presented by Silva-Corvalán (1986, p. 407).

In other studies based on the same set of 50 Mexicans in East Los Angeles, Silva-Corvalán (1994a, 1994, 1991) found that the 3rd generation HLSs employed the subjunctive mood more sporadically than the 1st and 2nd generations; however, she did not agree with Ocampo’s (1990) prediction of a possible disappearance of the subjunctive mood among the 3rd generation HLS participants. She did agree with Ocampo (1990) however, that all three generations of participants retained the use of the subjunctive in some obligatory contexts such as expressing when volition querer ‘to want’, purpose para que ‘in order that’, and in concessive clauses aunque ‘even though/although’.

Both Ocampo (1990) and Silva-Corvalán (1994) have presented evidence of a reduction of the use of the subjunctive mood amongst HLSs –especially 3rd generation HLSs–, however, Silva-Corvalán (1994) argues that this reduction might not be a consequence of dominant language influence, or language erosion and loss, but rather a trend or tendency also observed.

---

23 Ocampo (1990) defines categorical contexts as “construcciones oracionales que no permiten la variación modal” (p. 44). (My translation: sentence constructions that do not allow for modal variation).
among Spanish native speakers from some Latin American\(^\text{24}\) countries (see also Gutiérrez, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979). This latter argument led Silva-Corvalán (1994) to conclude that “the seeds of change are to be found in the basically monolingual communities of origin” (pp. 267-8), instead of representing a sign of possible linguistic influence from English. Silva-Corvalán (1994) also contends that the diminution in mood distinction in practice has been a gradual and selective evolutionary phenomenon (i.e., one that does not transpire in all contexts at once or happens suddenly and abruptly), that might be unique not only to Spanish but that is also taking place in other romance languages as well (p. 268). In the present study the use of the Spanish subjunctive mood among Spanish HLSs and monolingual Spanish native speakers were contrasted to find out if this particular HLS group in Georgia presented similar tendencies to Ocampo’s (1990), and Silva-Corvalán’s (1994a, 1994, 1991, 1986) participants in East Los Angeles.

Gutiérrez’s (1994) study also focused on the employment of the Spanish subjunctive mood amongst three generations of Spanish speakers; however, these speakers were all monolinguals born, raised, and still residing in Michoacán, Mexico. The first generation, G1, consisted of participants ages 51 and over; the second generation, G2, contained participants ages 30-50; and the third generation, G3, was comprised by participants ages 29 and younger. In this study Gutiérrez (1994) observed that among monolinguals the subjunctive mood proved to have relevance in the verbal system of its speakers. He also found two tendencies in the employment of subjunctive, which he compared to the findings presented by Ocampo (1990) for Spanish-speakers in East Los Angeles. The first tendency was that in obligatory contexts the youngest generation (ages 29 and under) tended to employ subjunctive more often (96% of the

\(^{24}\) Some of the countries named as places where this morphological simplification is taking place are: Argentina, Mexico, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela.
time) than the other two generations (G1: 93% and G2: 94%); and the second tendency was that in optional contexts the youngest generation tended to use the Spanish subjunctive mood less often than the other two generations (pp. 116-7). It seems that Gutiérrez’s G3 paralleled subjunctive use among Ocampo’s and Silva-Corvalán’s 3rd generation HLSs in the U.S. showing that younger monolinguals in Michoacán, Mexico, tended to simplify the subjunctive mood in optional contexts, using the indicative mood instead. Gutiérrez’s G3 also showed an over-generalization of indicative mood rules, in realms where variation between the subjunctive and the indicative moods was possible, but where the subjunctive mood would have been preferred by older generations. In summary, Gutiérrez’s (1994) findings concur with those presented by Silva-Corvalán (1994) and Rojas Anadón’s (1979) in terms of a reduction and simplification of the use of the Spanish subjunctive mood amongst Spanish monolinguals in contexts where Spanish already allows for some variety (based on context and speaker intentions).

If one considers that mood simplification might not be a phenomenon unique to HLSs in bilingual settings, or in setting where language contact is the norm, but that it is also transpiring among native Spanish speakers in monolingual contexts, one could possibly conceive, as many researchers have done (Colombi, 1997; Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994, 1991), that in situations of language contact (as it is the case of Spanish in the United States) the process of mood simplification, erosion, and loss will be accelerated. This situation was considered in the present study. In fact, it was expected that HLSs would implement the subjunctive more sporadically and less accurately than their monolingual counterparts, and that their subjunctive use would show signs of simplification and erosion whenever implemented.

Hislope (2002) added a new perspective to the discussion indicating that mood simplification and loss amongst HLSs might be a consequence the “amount of exposure that each
subsequent generation has with the Spanish language” (p. 42). Among the 10 HLSs who participated in her study she found that their use of the present subjunctive was infrequent, which she attributed to lack of exposure. Additionally, she suggested that the present subjunctive among HLSs is becoming simplified and observed “an erasing or leveling of a functional difference between the subjunctive and indicative moods” (p. 54). The present study considered two of these elements: language exposure and simplification (as a result of cross-linguistic influence from English to Spanish). Additionally, it considered the trend found among some monolinguals to simplify the subjunctive use (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979), especially among HLSs coming from Mexico which so far, has been one of the countries identified as having a propensity to simplify mood usage. An inclination towards mood simplification amongst Mexican HLSs and Colombian HLSs could be tied to the simplified forms already in use in the loci where they learned their Spanish (i.e., their U.S. homes and communities), without discounting the impact that their dominant language (English) could have on HLSs’ Spanish use. Data from the two Spanish monolingual groups (from Mexico and Colombia) were employed to determine if the simplification originated with them, or if it was a phenomenon only found solely among HLSs as a consequence of cross-linguistic influence between their dominant language (English) and their less dominant language (Spanish).

Martínez Mira (2009) problematized Silva-Corvalán’s (1994a, 1994, 1991, 1986) findings and questioned the proposed preference amongst HLSs to maintain the use of the subjunctive mood in certain manners of expression, such as those expressing volition, purpose, and concession. Martínez Mira (2009) worked with multigenerational Mexican HLSs from New Mexico comparing their data with those of a Mexican monolingual control group from Mexico. The main focus, however, was the retention of the subjunctive mood in concessive clauses,
taking into consideration the position of the concessive clause within the sentence (i.e., preposted or postposted). Martínez Mira found two reversals to the tendencies that had been reported prior her study:

1) First, she observed that some participants used “the subjunctive in contexts where the indicative was expected” (p. 115) which rejects the idea of simplification and over-generalization towards the indicative mood;

2) Second, the HLSs in her study employed the subjunctive mood more often in the oral task than in the written one, which was also unexpected since the more spontaneous a language production task is, the more simplification is expected.

Overgeneralizing the subjunctive instead of the indicative was the new trend found among Martínez Mira’s (2009) HLS participant-group. She suggested that the latter could have been a consequence of the type of tasks employed to elicit the written and the oral data in her study, or due to the topics involved. Rodríguez-Navarro (1991), Silva-Corvalán (1994), and Fairclough (2005) have written on this topic, and have argued (as does Martínez Mira) that the type and design of elicitation tasks, and the topics being discussed or addressed in each task can have a profound impact in the resulting data with regard to mood choices. This might have been the case in Martínez Mira’s (2009) study. Martínez Mira (2009) concluded that “[g]enerally speaking heritage speakers seemed to favor the indicative over the subjunctive in those contexts in which the subjunctive was expected” (p. 113) except for the oral activity. She also observed that her HLS participants employed the Spanish subjunctive mood in contexts where the indicative mood would have been expected (p. 115); and finally, she noted that even though HLSs and monolinguals used similar proportions of subjunctive in their oral interviews, they favored “different positioning of the subjunctive aunque clause with respect to the main
clause\textsuperscript{25}” (p. 120). In the written task HLSs employed the subjunctive mood less often than the monolinguals, and the positioning of the *aunque* clause did not seem to affect mood choice.

In conclusion, in Martínez Mira’s (2009) study mood did not appear to be a possible explanation of why the subjunctive had been retained in concessive clauses (p. 121). However, she suggested that a decrease in the employment of the subjunctive mood amongst HLSs cannot be explained solely in terms of generational linguistic impact or gap. She proposed that the following non-linguistic variables should be taken into consideration as factors influencing mood use, at least where written production is concerned: 1) HLSs might have less contact with Spanish (see also Hislope, 2002; Silva-Corvalán, 1986a); 2) HLSs acquisition of Spanish might be incomplete (see also Montrul, 2004, 2002; Valdés, 2001); and 3) HLSs might lack the semantic knowledge related to the nuances of the subjunctive (p. 119).

Martínez Mira (2009) and Silva-Corvalán (2001, 1994, 1991) have posited that since *aunque* structures are not commonly employed in monolingual Spanish speakers’ casual conversations, it is not uncommon to find that HLSs use it infrequently as well. Furthermore, from a structural viewpoint, Spanish allows the use of either mood (indicative or subjunctive) when utilizing concessive clauses in Spanish depending on what they are intending to express. The determining factor is the degree of commitment or assertion that language users have towards the validity or truth value of what is being expressed (Silva-Corvalán, 1994a); in other words, mood choice depends on their pragmatic perspective of the specific situation being discussed or written about (King, 1992; Guitart, 1990; Silva-Corvalán, 1985; Lavandera, 1983; Klein-Andreu, 1980).

In summary, prior research has compared Spanish subjunctive use among generations of native Spanish speakers to Spanish heritage language speakers (Silva-Corvalán, 1994a, 1994, \textsuperscript{25}80% preposed in monolinguals vs. 83% of postposed in heritage speakers.)
amongst three generations of Spanish native speakers (Gutiérrez, 1994); among HLSs (Hislope, 2003, 2002); and between HLSs, L2/FL learners and monolinguals (Martínez Mira, 2009). Said research has raised questions about: 1) the maintenance of Spanish subjunctive mood among Spanish HLSs and Spanish native speakers living in the U.S. in natural settings such as Spanish conversations with the researcher (Silva-Corvalán, 1994a, 1994, 1991, 1986; Ocampo, 1990); 2) the preferential use of the subjunctive among three generations of native Spanish speakers through written questionnaires (Gutiérrez, 1994); 3) the impact of teaching descriptive grammar to HLSs (Hislope, 2003, 2002); and 4) the employment of the Spanish subjunctive mood in oral and written tasks when comparing Mexican HLSs, and L2/FLs in the U.S. when compared to Mexican Spanish native speakers living in Mexico (Martínez Mira, 2009).

So far, the groups that have been more heavily studied have been Mexican HLSs alone or in comparison to Mexicans living in the U.S. (Silva-Corvalán, 1994a, 1994, 1991, 1986; Ocampo, 1990), or living in Mexico (Martínez Mira, 2009). The present study also included Mexican native Spanish speakers living in Mexico as well as Mexican HLSs living in the U.S., and added a new group to the discussion: Colombian native Spanish speakers living in Colombia and Colombian HLSs living in the U.S. Additionally, the present study raised questions on use and maintenance of the subjunctive mood among these four groups using a variety of tasks: an oral, a written, and a grammaticality judgment task, the last one being an innovation from other studies. Also, in this study demographic data was gathered in order to assist with the analysis and interpretation of the findings.

In order to facilitate comparisons between the studies reviewed in this chapter, Table 2.1 (below) presents brief notes on each one of them. Additionally, in the last section of Table 2.1
the present study is introduced so as to show the areas in which this study differs from earlier ones in terms of data gathering techniques, number of participants, and participants’ country of origin.
### Table 2.1

**Summary of Existing Studies Regarding the Subjunctive Use Amongst HLSs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Population and Design</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Tasks/Data Gathering Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Silva-Corvalán (1991, 1986)** | Mexican monolinguals and Mexican heritage language speakers from East Los Angeles 3 generations:  
G1 – Spanish native speakers  
G2 – HLSs (1st generation U.S. born)  
G3 – HLSs (2nd generation U.S. born) | 14 total  
- six from G1  
- four from G2  
- four from G3 | Conversations with the researcher (recorded between 1983-85) – Natural setting |
| **Ocampo (1990)**              | Same as Silva-Corvalán (1986)                                                         | 9 total  
- three from each generation | Same as Silva-Corvalán (1986) |
| **Silva-Corvalán (1994)**      | Same as Silva-Corvalán (1986)                                                         | 50 total               | Conversations with the researcher (recorded between 1983-85, and 1987-8) – Natural setting  
p. 15 - Fill-in-the-gap questionnaires (used for *ser* and *estar*). And  
“a set of questionnaires which explore speakers’ attitudes towards English and Spanish” (applied between 1987 and 1988). |
<p>| <strong>Silva-Corvalán (1994a)</strong>     | Same as Silva-Corvalán (1986)                                                         | 17 total               | Same as Silva-Corvalán (1994) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gutiérrez (1994)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks/Data Gathering Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish monolinguals residents of Michoacán, Mexico 3 generations classified by age groups. G1 – age 51 and over G2 – 30-50 years old G3 – age 29 and under</td>
<td><strong>25 total</strong></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hilsope (2003, 2002)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks/Data Gathering Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLSs</td>
<td><strong>10 total</strong></td>
<td>Written tasks (<em>cloze exercises</em>: testing production and <em>multiple choice exercise</em>: testing recognition): One pre-test (+ treatment +) Two post-tests (one immediate and one delayed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Martínez Mira (2009)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks/Data Gathering Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multigenerational HLSs from New Mexico L2 Spanish learners from New Mexico Spanish monolinguals from Mexico (control group)</td>
<td><strong>198 total</strong></td>
<td>One oral interview Two written questionnaires: “written production” (p. 111) “familiarity data” (p. 111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PRESENT STUDY</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks/Data Gathering Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 groups: 1) Mexican MONOs 2) Mexican HLSs 3) Colombian MONOs 4) Colombian HLSs</td>
<td><strong>56 total</strong></td>
<td>Oral/Transcription Task (OT) Written Task (WT) Grammaticality Judgment Task (GJT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


METHODS

This study explored two language production areas and a comprehension/receptive skill area related to the Spanish subjunctive mood amongst bilingual Spanish-English HLSs and compared with Spanish monolinguals. It investigated whether subjunctive patterns differed by medium of expression (speaking versus writing), country of origin (Colombia versus Mexico), version of language (monolingual Spanish versus Spanish heritage language speakers), and free production (OT and WT) versus recognition (GJT).

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1) Do Spanish HLSs in the U.S. use the subjunctive mood in Spanish?
2) Do Spanish HLSs recognize obligatory contexts for subjunctive use?
3) Do Spanish monolinguals use the subjunctive more than the Spanish HLSs?
4) Are Spanish HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish influenced and simplified by their dominant language (English) when compared to the subjunctive use amongst monolinguals?
5) Does usage differ by level of focus on formality and form; i.e., speaking vs. writing?
6) Does HLSs’ usage parallel difference in usage of the subjunctive between Mexican and Colombian monolinguals?

Rationale for the Study

The first motivation for studying subjunctive use among HLSs was that previously published studies (Martínez Mira, 2009; Hislope, 2005; Silva-Corvalán, 1994a, 1994, 1991, 1986; Ocampo, 1990) suggested that when the HLSs’ heritage (superordinate) language suffers intense, permanent and prolonged contact with the HLSs’ dominant language, the
heritage language undergoes simplification at many levels, including the verbal and mood systems, which were topics of interest in the present study. In the case of Spanish HLSs, this simplification would mean a simplification, reduction, or loss of the use of the subjunctive mood in specific situations (Ocampo, 1990). Therefore, the present study was developed in order to test for potential simplification and loss or reduction in the Spanish mood system of HLSs when they are using superordinate language to express and evaluate noun and adjective clauses, and to compare their mood use to that of monolingual Spanish native speakers.

Based on Blake’s (1985) findings that suggest that by age seven monolingual Spanish children have full command of adjectival clauses (p. 167), it was expected that the English system would not negatively influence the HLSs’ mood choice in adjective clauses. It was reasoned that despite having English as their dominant language, given that these HLS participants grew up hearing and in many cases speaking Spanish at home and in their communities, the feel and intuition (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004) for mood choice in adjective and noun clauses would still be available to them. This expectation was proven by the data analyzed for this study. Both HLS groups in this study’s participant sample scored at similar levels when compared to their monolingual counterparts, however, they showed differences when compared to each other (i.e., the Mexican HLS group scored lower in the production tasks than their Colombian counterparts, and the Colombian HLSs group scored lower in the recognition task when compared to their Mexican counterparts).

A second motivation for studying the subjunctive use among HLSs was a previously observed tendency in certain HLS Spanish varieties and in different generations of HLSs to simplify Spanish morphology (Martínez Mira, 2009; Hislope, 2003, 2002; Torreblanca,

---

26 In this study the term simplification is employed following Silva-Corvalán’s (1994a) definition, which is “a complex process involving the expansion of a form to a larger number of contexts (i.e., generalization) at the
1997; Silva-Corvalán, 1994a, 1994, 1986; Ocampo, 1990). This simplification had been
documented by two phenomena: expansion which is an increased implementation of the
indicative mood in the HLSs’ Spanish even when the subjunctive would have been preferred
by native Spanish speakers (Hislope, 2003, 2002; Silva-Corvalán, 1994a, 1994, 1986;
Ocampo, 1990); and contraction, defined as a decreased implementation of the subjunctive in
contexts where native Spanish speakers would generally use the subjunctive mood, as a
direct consequence of expansion (Martínez Mira, 2009). It was a second purpose of this
study to find out if these Mexican and Colombian HLSs in Georgia were examples of
Spanish subjunctive mood simplification compared to their monolingual counterparts and
when compared to each other.

A third reason for studying the subjunctive mood among HLSs was because it
represents one of the last syntactic elements to be acquired in Spanish (even by monolingual
speakers of the language); because the frequency of use is not as common as the indicative
mood, and also because it is one of the most difficult concepts to comprehend, internalize,
and employ among L1 English speakers/L2 Spanish learners (Gudmestad, 2006; Fairclough,
2005; Lubbers-Quesada, 1998; Stokes & Krashen, 1990). The delayed acquisition of the
subjunctive among monolingual Spanish speakers, the lower rate of employment of the
subjunctive mood, and the difficulty of comprehension and internalization of this mood
among Spanish learners are of interest in this study because HLSs sample participants were
either 1) born and raised in Colombia or Mexico and moved to the U.S. by age 13; or 2) grew
up hearing and in most instances speaking Spanish until they began their schooling in the U.S.

expense of a form…which is used in increasingly lower frequency” (p. 257); in other words, “simplification is
thus understood to involve the generalization of a form X to a larger number of contexts, which in turn implies
the loss of some selectional restrictions and consequent loss or reduction of the use of a competing form Y” (p.
589, Silva-Corvalán, 1986a; other definitions also found in Silva-Corvalán, 1991, 1994).
Considering that the limit age for full acquisition of the first language is 13 years of age (Silva-Corvalán, 1994), it is plausible that those HLSs who moved from Colombia and Mexico to the U.S. before age 13 might not have solidified their acquisition of the Spanish mood system before coming here. Even when schooled in a Spanish-speaking country for up to six years, there is no guarantee that the Spanish mood system was fully acquired by these children. Regarding the HLS group born and raised in the U.S. in Spanish-speaking households, a characteristic common to all was that they grew up hearing and speaking Spanish at home, and in some instances and to some extent in their communities. This could mean that U.S. born HLSs learned by being exposed to what their environment (including media if any) could teach them.

As a consequence of the nature of both HLS groups considered in the present study, it is conceivable that neither HLS group acquired the Spanish mood system fully as children although these HLSs’ use of Spanish did not freeze or stop when they started being schooled in the U.S. In fact, data gathered through demographic surveys showed that HLS participants in this study’s sample continued using Spanish with older generations (parents and grandparents)\(^\text{27}\), and many of them took Spanish classes at some point in their lives (see Tables 3.6 and 3.7 below). It is important to mention that having taken Spanish classes does not guarantee full acquisition of the Spanish mood system. This may be due to at least three phenomena:

1) First, from a psycholinguistic perspective, it has been determined that mood selection and subjunctive production “seem to resist automatization” in Spanish (Collentine, 2010, p. 42).

\(^{27}\) Although they chose to use English with siblings and cousins.
2) Secondly, it has been documented that mood selection in Spanish continues to be challenging to Spanish learners (L2 Spanish as well as HLS) even after having many formal opportunities to implement it (Stokes and Krashen 1990; Terrell, Baycroft, & Perrone, 1987).

3) Last but not least, having grown up speaking Spanish at home and in the communities, does not assure a complete acquisition of mood in Spanish, i.e., “[e]ven when learners are exposed to the subjunctive in authentic, immersed contexts, the acquisition of the subjunctive and mood-selection abilities is rarely guaranteed” (Collentine, 2010, p. 45). This could be attributed to two intrinsic characteristics of the Spanish subjunctive mood: first, it is difficult to accurately notice it because in most instances the subjunctive forms differ from the indicative forms in minimal ways (i.e., thematic vowels – for example *hablar* (to speak) → *habla* (he speaks – [ IND]) → *hable* (he speak [SUBJ]) (Fernández, 2008; Buckwalter, 2001; Lee & Rodríguez, 1997; Leow, 1993); and secondly, because the subjunctive’s overall communicative value is low, as Collentine (2010) explains “[t]he subjunctive mood is frequently a redundant reflection of modality expressed elsewhere in the sentence…” (p. 40).

Despite the three reasons and motivations for studying subjunctive among HLSs, it is important to highlight that this mood is used by native speakers to express degrees of, for example, commitment to what is being expressed (Palmer, 1986/2001).

One objective of this study was to seek unidirectional cross-linguistic influence or transfer in HLSs’ employment of the Spanish subjunctive. It was anticipated that this influence would transpire in many different ways: at the conscious and unconscious levels
(Meisel, 1983), in forward or backward motion from English to Spanish and vice versa – although only the English–Spanish influence would be considered (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Jarvis & Odlin, 2000), in successfully or unsuccessful ways (positive and negative transfer, Jarvis & Odlin, 2000; Kellerman, 1995, 1979), and in cases of avoidance, simplification, or omission when compared to their monolingual counterparts (Jarvis & Odlin, 2000). For the present study the following research questions and hypotheses were formulated:

For questions (1) **Do Spanish HLSs in the U.S. use the subjunctive mood in Spanish?** (3) **Do Spanish monolinguals use the subjunctive more than the Spanish HLSs?** And (4) **Are Spanish HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish influenced and simplified by their dominant language (English) when compared to the subjunctive use amongst monolinguals?** The hypotheses were the following: a) Both HLS groups would use the subjunctive mood but not as often or consistently as the monolingual groups (i.e., more mood simplification was expected among HLSs); b) HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish would be influenced by their dominant language (English), and simplified when compared to MONOs’ mood choices; and c) MEX_HLSs would use the subjunctive less often and accurately than their COL_HLSs counterparts.

For question (2) **Do Spanish HLSs recognize obligatory contexts for subjunctive use?** The expectation was that: a) Both HLS groups would be more capable of recognizing the need for subjunctive than to produce it (see scale under “d”); and b) Both monolingual groups would employ the subjunctive consistently in production (oral and writing tasks) as well as judging tasks (grammaticality judgment task).

The expectation for question (5) **Does usage differ by level of focus on formality and form; i.e., speaking vs. writing?** was that all groups would use the subjunctive more often and
accurately in writing than speaking because it was expected that in a more formal context participants would concentrate more on form.

For the last question (6) Does HLSs’ usage parallel difference in usage of the subjunctive between Mexican and Colombian monolinguals? The expectation was that MEX_MONOs would simplify the use of the subjunctive more often than COL_MONOs.

Regarding HLSs, in this study it was expected to find an encroachment of the English mood system (i.e., HLSs’ dominant language) upon the Spanish mood system (less dominant), not only due to the influence that the dominant language could have over the less dominant one but also due to the Spanish mood system’s permeability (Silva-Corvalán, 1986). It was anticipated that this encroachment (Marian & Kaushanskaya, 2007; Odlin, 1989) would be evinced by the use of either a lower percentage of subjunctive amongst HLSs when compared to monolinguals, or a different use of the Spanish mood system when performing the three different tasks for this study. Additionally, it was expected that HLSs would produce more cases of overgeneralization (Meisel, 1983) when compared to the monolingual groups; which would be revealed by an HLS tendency to employ the indicative mood even in realms where the subjunctive would have been preferred by their monolingual counterparts.

**Setting and Participants**

Four groups participated in the present study: Mexican Spanish monolinguals (MEX_MONOs) (n=10); Mexican Spanish Heritage Language Speakers (MEX_HLSs) (n=18); Colombian Spanish monolinguals (COL_MONOs) (n=10); and Colombian Spanish Heritage Language Speakers (COL_HLSs) (n=18).
All 36 HLSs were college students or college graduates and were Spanish-English bilinguals. The median age for Colombian HLSs was 23 years old, and the gender distribution was 11 females and seven males (for a complete age/gender distribution for all groups see Appendix N). For Mexican HLSs the median age was also 23 years of age and the gender distribution was 16 females and two males. Most HLS participants had received formal instruction in Spanish either before the study began or while the study was underway. A smaller number never took a Spanish class before; and others studied foreign languages but never Spanish. Of the 36 HLSs who participated in the study none of them considered or claimed Spanish as their dominant language, although they might have considered it their first language. Both HLS groups contained individuals who were born and raised in the U.S. for Mexican or Colombian families, or born in Colombia or Mexico but who had moved to the U.S. before age 13. For this study, the age limit of 13 established for HLSs born abroad was based on Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) work. The reasons were two-fold: 1) because by age 11 or 12 individuals have firmly acquired the linguistic system of their native language (in my participants’ case Spanish); and 2) because the present study included individuals ages 18 and up, and it was paramount that foreign born-U.S. raised participants had a minimum of five to six years of immersion in the English language and culture in order to allow the latter language to actually have an effect on the participants’ first or native tongue (Silva-Corvalán, 1994).

Each of the two monolingual groups contained 10 participants each of fully competent monolingual adult native Spanish speakers from Mexico and Colombia who were college students or college graduates. The median age for Colombian MONOs was 26 years old, and the gender distribution was six females and four males (for a complete age/gender
distribution for all groups see Appendix N). For Mexican HLSs the median age was 35 years of age and the gender distribution was five females and five males. In the present study the term *monolingual* is loosely employed because finding true monolinguals (i.e., individuals with no second language knowledge) at a university level in either Spanish-speaking country was impossible. However, while monolingual participants might have known languages other than Spanish, none considered themselves to be Spanish-English bilinguals. The inclusion of monolingual groups was done with the purpose of comparing their Spanish subjunctive use in adjective and noun clauses with that of the HLSs. It was anticipated that this comparison would help determine (if it existed) a possible influence of the English mood system (HLSs’ dominant language) over their Spanish. The only way in which this influence could be validly tested was by contrasting the HLSs’ performance with that of monolinguals on the same three tasks (OT, WT, and GJT).

Because the backgrounds of HLS participants in the study were assumed to be more heterogeneous and their language learning histories more complex than those of monolinguals, more detail on their backgrounds was gathered, including place of birth, number of years in the U.S. (if foreign born), and Spanish courses taken either in a Spanish-speaking country or in the U.S. This information was employed as additional information when analyzing the data. Complete tables containing this information (exclusively relating to HLSs) can be found in Appendix O.

*Identifying and Recruiting Participants*

HLSs were identified and recruited in three ways: a) through three Latino/Hispanic Student Associations at one institution in the southeastern U.S., b) through snow-balling (i.e., participants referring friends who fit the study’s criteria); and c) Via Facebook®. The
criteria for recruiting HLS participants were that they had to be at least 18 years of age, either born in the U.S. to Mexican or Colombian parents and raised in the U.S. learning Spanish as their first language or born in Mexico or Colombia, lived in either country before the age of 13 and moved and lived in the U.S. since then, and that they had to be college students or college graduates.

Monolingual participants were recruited by contacting the UNAM (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) in Mexico and the UDEM (Universidad de Medellín) in Colombia, and inviting students, and professors to participate.

The criteria for recruiting monolingual participants were that they had to be at least 18 years of age, be Mexican or Colombian Spanish monolinguals, and be college students, or college graduates.

**The Facebook© Experience**

Facebook© was also used as a research tool in this study. Most HLS participants signed the consent form agreeing to participate in the study during the spring semester; however, the actual gathering of the data did not begin until the following summer. This proved to be a titanic task that required perseverance, persistence, and ingenuity in order to gather all the data by the end of the summer. Many individuals who had agreed to participate in the study during the spring semester had left town and in some instances had even left the country for study abroad programs; others had graduated, or had found summer jobs. The common denominator in most of these participants was that they had forgotten they had agreed to participate in the study which made it nearly impossible to reach them and get them to participate. To locate the participants who had committed themselves to the

---

28 This was done in order to avoid any possible influence from English on their Spanish.
project during the spring semester a Facebook© account was created. Facebook© allowed me to not only reconnect with individuals who had previously agreed to participate in the study, but also to find more people who were willing to participate and who fit the study’s criteria. It was thanks to using this tool that data collection was completed by the end of the summer.

**Data Collection**

For HLSs the data gathering procedure followed three steps and six different instruments:

1) Signing a consent form (Appendix A) stating the participant’s willingness to participate in the present study;

2) Completing a socio-demographic survey (Appendix D); and

3) Participating in an online demographic survey/consent form (via surveymonkey.com) (Appendix C) and three Spanish language tasks (via Wimba and surveymonkey.com) (Appendices E, F, and G):
   a. the oral/transcription task (OT) (via Wimba) (Appendix E);
   b. the written task (WT) (via surveymonkey.com) (Appendix F); and
   c. the grammaticality judgment task (GJT) (Appendix G) (via surveymonkey.com).

Monolinguals completed the same online demographic survey/consent form; and the same three linguistic tasks as the HLSs, using the same online programs (Wimba and surveymonkey.com).

All participants worked with the same linguistic elements: clause, noun (nominal) clause, and adjective (relative). In this study they were defined in the following manner:
1. **Clause**: A group of words that expresses an idea and contains a subject and a conjugated or finite verb (in contrast to an “infinite” or non-conjugated form such as an infinitive). For the most part, the clauses utilized and elicited in this study were complex clauses that contained two parts: an independent clause (antecedent or matrix) and a dependent clause (complement). The complex clauses implemented in this study were noun and adjective clauses.

2. **Noun (nominal) clauses** present in a dependent clause serve as the direct object or predicate complement of another verb – usually presented in the independent clause – (or as the subject of a verb), just as a noun does. Nominal clauses in Spanish frequently require a conjugated verb.

3. **Adjective (relative) clauses** appear in dependent clauses and are used with the purpose of describing or limiting a noun or pronoun – also known as the antecedent or matrix of the sentence.

Next, the three linguistic tasks employed in the present study in order to gather the linguistic data are presented and explained.

**Linguistic Tasks**

All participants were administered three language production/reception tasks: an oral/transcription task (OT) (Appendix E); a written task (WT) (Appendix F); and a grammaticality judgment task (GJT) - (Appendix G). Presentational skills (speaking and writing) comprised the main focus of this study; however, in order to accomplish any of the three required tasks participants were expected to also possess both receptive skills (i.e., reading and listening). The OT and the WT addressed the same topic (i.e., finding a nanny for a weekend to take care of the participants’ imaginary or real child/children) and were
semi-structured (i.e., guided and open-ended). The same topic was used in both tasks in order to control for extraneous linguistic variables that have been problematic for other researchers using a variety of topics (Martínez Mira, 2009; Fairclough, 2005; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rodríguez-Navarro, 1991). Each task was designed to test the participants’ use of the subjunctive mood, though they were never told this. Additionally, each task was presented to participants in degrees of production spontaneity and open-endedness: first, participants were asked to complete the OT, because it was the least formal production task, with the least focus on form but still tapped into reception knowledge (i.e., understanding the oral questions they were being asked). The oral section of the OT gathered oral data produced by the participants naturally, in a guided open-ended manner that required a spontaneous use of language. The transcription idea came from Fairclough’s (2005) study. The transcription section of the OT had two purposes: 1) to confirm that the data had indeed been recorded into the system; and 2) (and most importantly) to test for instances of self-correction among monolinguals and HLSs participants (Fairclough, 2005).

Secondly, participants were instructed to complete the WT, which was a more formal production task that was more form-focused but also required receptive knowledge (i.e., being able to read the questions they were to answer in writing). The WT was designed to gather participant written production in a semi-structured and guided manner. The researcher hypothesized that the intrinsically more formal format of a written activity would allow or even force participants to focus more on form than in the OT. It was also expected that the WT would provide data containing more precise information on the participants’ tacit knowledge of the employment of the Spanish subjunctive mood. It was speculated that some HLS participants might avoid, simplify, or omit the subjunctive mood (Jarvis & Odlin, 2000;
Silva-Corvalán, 1994); as well as show evidence of an incomplete acquisition of the subjunctive mood (Martínez Mira, 2009; Montrul, 2004, 2002; Valdés, 2001). If either of these two speculations was validated, participants would overgeneralize the use of the indicative mood using it in contexts were both moods could be accepted, or where only the subjunctive would be preferred by monolinguals.

Finally, participants were asked to complete a GJT, which was the most form-focused of the three tasks and where receptive skills were tested. The GJT required production knowledge, albeit minimal when compared to the other two tasks (OT and WT) and was created to gauge participants’ ability to recognize (as opposed to producing) obligatory contexts for subjunctive when focused on form. The instrument presented grammatical and ungrammatical items. Participants were asked to judge if the items were correct or incorrect and correct them if needed. It was expected that participants’ reaction to grammatically correct and incorrect statements would tap into tacit linguistic knowledge that might not be evidenced in the more spontaneous and open-ended tasks. It was also expected that the structured nature of the GJT would allow for more accuracy in participants’ subjunctive mood if in fact they possessed that knowledge. The matrices employed in the GJT to elicit the subjunctive mood do not permit variation or a choice between the indicative and the subjunctive, e.g. expressing desiderative clauses such as *Quiero que vengas* ‘I want you to come’ (Haverkate, 2002). Others, such concessive clauses, allow for modal variation depending on the message intended by the language user. Such items were designed to present a more challenging setting for all participants because they were required to understand the context in which the action was taking place in order to decide which mood
would best express the meanings conveyed in them. The distracters included in the GJT were all cases of indicative use.

Before the present study took place, a pilot study was carried out. The pilot-study was used to make sure that instructions were clearly stated and that participants would be able to work with the given topic (i.e., looking for a nanny). It was also designed to determine the how much time participants spent on each task. The latter information became invaluable because it allowed me to present future participants with a specific participation time limit (two hours) for all three tasks. Based on the pilot study the number of questions presented in each task was modified so that participants in the study could complete them within two hours.

All communication to and from the participants was performed solely in Spanish. Instructions for all tasks and explanations on how to access and sign into Blackboard Vista 8.0 and surveymonkey.com were furnished to participants in Spanish. The Spanish-only language choice was based on earlier studies that indicate that using more than one language may skew results. Interference and unnecessary influence might be observed if participants receive instructions to fulfill a task in one language, and are expected to accomplish the task using a different one –i.e., receiving instructions in English and being expected to produce language or judge statements in Spanish (Fairclough, 2005).

In order to facilitate data gathering (especially with the Spanish monolinguals), all four groups completed their participation via two programs that could be accessed, completed, and submitted online. For the OT, Wimba and Microsoft Word were employed; and for the WT and the GJT surveymonkey.com, an online survey site that allows for questions (WT) or sentences (GJT) to be presented individually (one per page) was used. In
the case of the WT participants used a text box provided under each question to answer it; and in the GJT they employed the text box to write a corrected version of any statement they judged erroneous. In order to access either online program (Wimba or surveymonkey.com) each participant received email messages with detailed instructions on how to complete the tasks and links to access them. The employment of Wimba for the OT was paramount because it allowed participants to listen to pre-recorded questions, record their answers, and listen to their answers in order to transcribe questions and answers into the Microsoft Word document. This program was access through Blackboard Vista 8.0, a web-based instructional platform used by the university where this study originated.

Participants were instructed not to make any changes to their answers once they had recorded or written them. For the OT this was explicitly stated in the task’s instructions and for the WT and the GJT only an arrow pointing forward was present on each page of the tasks. This directed participants to only move forward to the next answer. This was done in order to avoid potential influence of the different tasks given to the participants, or after-the-fact realizations of how something should have been said or written. Discouraging re-recording or re-writing provided the most spontaneous and natural use of language by HLSs and monolinguals; and it also limited the amount of time required per participant for this study, which encouraged the completion of all tasks by all participants. The objective of the tasks used in the present study was to gather the most spontaneous, intuitive response possible from participants.

As participants completed the last two tasks, they were emailed me letting me know that all tasks had been completed. Upon receipt of the completion message I would checked the last two tasks to confirm that everything had been received and recorded. At this point a
“thank you” email message was sent to each participant corroborating that I had received their work and that upon checking it, it was determined that their participation was indeed finished.

**Data Gathering Online: Pros and Cons**

The advantages of gathering data online were that all participants, whether in the U.S. or abroad, were reachable and able to participate. Even U.S. participants who were studying abroad or had moved away from where the study was being conducted were able to take part in the study.

However, there were several disadvantages that at different times impeded the progress of the study. First, because participants completed the tasks individually whenever they had time, many had to be reminded of the importance of their completion of all tasks. Additionally, in spite of elaborate directions and a step-by-step guide, Spanish monolinguals experienced major difficulties and confusion navigating the online delivery websites since the home page and navigation information was in English. The program also asked participants to change their password upon accessing the system, which proved especially problematic for the Spanish monolinguals. The researcher solved this difficulty by changing the original password *before* sending the log-in information to the monolinguals. Sending a pre-determined username and password (that I created) proved extremely valuable; however, more than 10 Colombian monolingual participants were lost due to their inability to access the OT online.

**Consent Forms**

HLS participants signed a paper consent form (Appendix A) and completed the surveymonkey.com consent form/demographic survey (Appendix C). Monolinguals
completed only the surveymonkey.com consent form/demographic survey (Appendix C). The HLS consent form was written and presented to the participants in English for two reasons: 1) to expedite the reading process because HLSs filled out the demographic survey at the same meeting where the study was presented and volunteers were recruited, and 2) to assure that all HLS participants who agreed to participate in the study knew exactly what the study entailed, what was expected of them in terms of participation, time commitment, and their rights with regard to their participation in the present study, and the ability to withdraw from it if needed or desired. The socio-demographic survey/consent form completed via surveymonkey.com was in Spanish (see Appendix C).

**Demographic Surveys**

After signing the consent form to participate in the study HLSs completed a pencil and paper demographic survey. All participants (HLSs and MONOs) completed a demographic survey online via surveymonkey.com. This also served as a consent form for monolingual participants, who only completed the surveymonkey.com demographic survey.

The pencil and paper socio-demographic survey completed by the HLSs was designed partially based on questionnaires developed by Martínez Mira (2009) and Hislope (2002). The survey’s first page included a written explanation of the study. The second page of the survey began with **Part A** which included questions about participants’ family of origin. **Part B** inquired about participants’ reading, writing, speaking, and listening practices in Spanish. **Part C** surveyed participants’ language preference in specific contexts such as expressing anger, making a request, and politely declining an invitation (see Appendix D for a complete list of contexts). **Part D** collected individually created self-definitions about personal identity (culture, language, and ethnicity) and other information about language use,
Spanish courses they had taken or were taking at the time the survey was completed and about any other language(s) the HLS participants might have studied.

To ensure confidentiality, participants were assigned a number and their surveys contained only the number that appeared on their survey. The first page of the survey with the consent form and number was detached and stored in a secure location.

The demographic survey (via surveymonkey.com) given to all participants included: consent to participate in the study, first and last names, age, gender, occupation, and place of origin.

**Online Consent Form/Demographic Survey**

All participants completed the online consent form/demographic survey. For HLSs, who had already signed a consent form and completed a demographic survey this step in the process was completed immediately before completing the last 2 tasks. For the monolinguals, who had not signed a paper consent form, or completed a paper and pencil demographic survey, this was the first step before doing any of the three tasks.

The online consent form/demographic survey consisted of seven questions: first and last names; age; agreement to participate in the study; gender; nationality and town of origin; and occupation. For online consent form/demographic survey complete instructions, please refer to Appendix H. Once the consent form/demographic survey was completed, participants were instructed to proceed on to the linguistic tasks described in the next section. The instructions received by participants at this point, can be found in Appendix I.

**Task Description**

Next, the three tasks used in this study to gather data will be presented in the order they were completed by participants (i.e., the oral/transcription task or OT; the written task or
WT, and finally the grammaticality judgment task or GJT).

**Oral/transcription Task (OT)**

All four groups completed the OT (see Appendix E) which was comprised of two parts. The first part consisted of 10 oral questions pre-recorded at a normal native speaker pace and stated twice. Two questions in the oral task were distracters and eight were designed to trigger the present subjunctive in the participants’ oral answers. Participants were to listen to each pre-recorded question and answer it oral orally until they completed all ten and they were asked not to re-record their answers. For the second part of the OT, participants were instructed to listen to the recorded question and their given answer in order to transcribe them verbatim in a word document. Three sub-questions were raised based on the transcription activity: Are participants’ transcription of their own speech faithful to their actual oral production? Do participants modify their spoken language in the transcriptions? And are there aspects that go unnoticed by the speakers/transcribers of their own speech?

The OT was done online using the program *Wimba*. In order to complete the OT participants received emails walking them through the steps needed to access the task. The instructions participants received can be found in Appendix J; but the steps are included next:

1) Access the *Wimba* site (with a username and password especially created for each participant) where they encountered a page with written instructions in Spanish and the situation/context for the OT (i.e., looking for a nanny for their real/imaginary child/children for a weekend);

2) Select the icons that led to each of the 10 questions that needed to be answered orally in order to complete the first part of the OT;

---

29 In some cases, for example when participants abroad were having trouble accessing the web-based instructional platform *Blackboard* and *Wimba*, I communicated with them via *Messenger*. Unfortunately, some times these interactions proved useless and led to losing participants.
3) Listen, answer each question individually, and post/submit each oral answer;

4) Listen to each question and answer (right after recording it), and type both of them in a word document;

5) Participants were instructed to record each answer only once (no re-recordings allowed).

After reading the email containing procedures and instructions, participants were encouraged to take a few minutes to think about the OT’s situation. At no time were participants allowed to see or preview the questions that they were going to be asked. As participants were ready to begin, they were directed to click on the first icon labeled “Pregunta UNO”. Upon doing so, a new page opened up, in it they found the following information: how to access all questions, and how to return to the Main Menu once the answer to each question had been recorded. The instructions read as follows:

Original Spanish Version:
1. Escucha la pregunta (vas a escucharla DOS veces).
2. Presiona "REPLY" y graba tu respuesta - PRESIONA EL BOTON "POST" antes de seguir adelante, sino no se graba nada.
3. Re-escucha la pregunta y tu respuesta (para asegurarte de que se grabó), y escribe las en un documento de Microsoft Word.
4. Al terminar pasa a la siguiente pregunta - 10 en total. Para encontrar la siguiente pregunta ve al Home Page (el enlace está arriba a la izquierda), y selecciona la siguiente pregunta a escuchar/contestar.
Gracias.

English Translation:
1. Listen to the question (you will hear it TWICE).
2. Press the “REPLY” button and record your answer – HIT THE “POST” BUTTON before continuing otherwise your answers will not be uploaded and recorded.
3. Re-listen to the question and your answer (to make sure it was recorded), and write both of them down in a Microsoft Word document.
4. Upon finishing, go to the next question – a total of 10. In order to find the next question, please go to the Home Page (you can find the link at the top left corner of this page), and select the next question that to which you will listen and reply.
Thank you.

The OT was designed with two purposes in mind, the first part of the OT was used to gather oral data produced by the participants naturally and spontaneously in a guided open-
ended manner; and the second part of the OT, the transcription\textsuperscript{30}, was collected to make sure that the data had been recorded into the system, but most importantly, to test for instances of self-correction among monolinguals and HLSs participants (Fairclough, 2005).

After completing and uploading the oral replies (one at a time), and finishing the second part of the OT, the transcription task, participants submitted the latter via electronic mail. Once the oral questions recorded in Wimba, and that the transcription had been received, each participant received an invitation (via email) with an explanation of the next phase of their participation (i.e., the WT and the GJT) and instructions in Spanish on how to proceed and links to surveymonkey.com. As with the OT, participants were not allowed to see the questions included in the WT or the GJT beforehand.

**Written Task (WT)**

The WT (see Appendix F) required participants to answer 10 questions in writing. The first two questions were used for organizational purposes (asking name and origin); and the next three were distracters. The remaining five were designed to trigger the present subjunctive in the participants’ answers. These questions asked participants to express themselves in the same three different subjunctive contexts encountered in the OT: volition; lack of existence; and impersonal expressions. However, given the level of formality of a written task, and the extra time and space allotted to formulate answers more thoroughly (i.e., no time or word limits were set for this activity); an increase in the incidence of subjunctive use was expected in the last five questions of the WT. The change in medium of expression was expected to affect the way participants used the subjunctive mood. In this task participants were asked to answer the pre-written questions in writing, in the order they appeared on the screen, and they were not allowed to return to a previously answered

\textsuperscript{30} based on Fairclough’s (2005) study.
question in order to change it (only an arrow pointing forward was present on the participants’ screen). Instructions for the written task are in Appendix K.

The WT was designed to gather participant written production in a semi-structured and guided manner. The researcher hypothesized that the written format would allow or even force participants to focus more on form than in the OT, therefore providing data containing more precise information on the participants’ tacit knowledge of the employment of the Spanish subjunctive mood. It was speculated that some HLS participants would avoid the subjunctive mood, increasing the implementation of the indicative mood in their answers in contexts were both moods could be accepted, or where only one of the two moods would be preferred by monolinguals (Silva-Corvalán, 1994). This behavior could evince an incomplete acquisition of the subjunctive mood among HLSs (Martínez Mira, 2009; Montrul, 2004, 2002; Valdés, 2001).

Grammaticality Judgment Task (GJT)

Once the WT was completed, participants were instructed to go back to the invitation email received after completing the OT to find the link for the last task: the GJT (see Appendix G). The main purpose of the GJT was to compare the participants’ semi-structured but largely natural, open-ended, and spontaneous spoken and written productive language knowledge of the subjunctive found in the OT and the WT, with those of a more formal and even more focused-on-form recognition task, the GJT. This last task was expected to tap into participants’ tacit receptive knowledge of mood choice in the Spanish language. With the GJT I was able to first, assess participants’ mastery of the Spanish subjunctive mood in the same three contexts as previous tasks: volition, lack of existence, and impersonal
expressions; and secondly, to assess if narrowing participants’ linguistic options made HLSs and monolinguals use the language in similar ways.

The instructions for the GJT (found in Appendix L) directed participants to read a story containing 25 items, and to judge them as correct or incorrect. They were not specifically told to look at verb forms for possible problems or errors but they were asked to correct the items they marked as incorrect. Participant corrections were to be written in the space provided below each item. Providing participants a space to write corrections allowed me to quantify mood changes versus other language related issues in each item; and to accurately determine if the corrections were based on mood or if the participant had made a change elsewhere in the item while accepting the mood as it was originally presented in the item. Each item was presented individually (one per page).

In the GJT five random items were distracters. For the GJT this means that distracter items did not include the subjunctive mood and were included throughout the story to aid with its flow. The remaining 20 involved the use of subjunctive in adjective/relative clauses and in nominal/noun clauses in three contexts: volition\(^{31}\), lack of existence\(^{32}\), and impersonal expressions\(^{33}\). Of the 20 noun and adjective clauses, seven were designed to be judged as correct, and 13 were expected to be judged as incorrect. As suggested by Montrul, Foote, and Perpiñán (2008), the 25 statements included in the GJT were contextualized –made into a single story– (p. 521) in order to make the task less artificial. It was believed that this contextualization would aid participants’ comprehension of the items and would allow them to determine the possible linguistic appropriateness of each item more accurately. Given that the GJT was a story; all its items were presented in individual screens and in the exact same

\(^{31}\) Also known as desiderative expressions (Haverkate, 2002).

\(^{32}\) Also known as potential existence in a virtual world (Haverkate, 2002).

\(^{33}\) Also known as evaluative expressions (Haverkate, 2002).
order to all participants. Participants were not given a time limit in which to complete the GJT, which allowed students ample time to consider each statement before judging it, and sufficient time to write the corrected phrase for those items they considered incorrect.

The last screen of the GJT announced to participants that they had completed their participation in the study (see Appendix M), thanked them for their participation, and it encouraged them to contact me to learn about the study’s results and findings.

The GJT was designed to ascertain participants’ grammatical competence with regard to the employment of the Spanish subjunctive mood in obligatory as well as optional contexts in medium of expression that focused on form. It was expected that participants’ reaction to grammatically correct and incorrect statements would reveal whether or not possible errors made on the other two tasks were a result of the more spontaneous and natural nature of the OT and the WT or due to participants’ lack of ability or linguistic knowledge. It was also expected that the structured nature of the GJT would allow for more accuracy in participants’ subjunctive mood if in fact they possessed the knowledge.

Data Organization and Analysis

The data gathered from the demographic surveys completed by all HLSs was organized by skill (reading, writing, speaking, and listening comprehension) in separate Microsoft Excel® spreadsheets. For example, in organizing the self-reported reading data from the survey (part B of the survey), the data organization looked as follows:
Table 3.1

**Sample Spreadsheet of Reading Skills among HLSs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Magazines</th>
<th>Literature (fiction)</th>
<th>Academic books</th>
<th>Newsletters</th>
<th>Poetry</th>
<th>Other (explain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEX_HLS 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y – blogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX_HLS 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX_HLS 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y - chat rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part C of the survey presented participants with 19 possible scenarios for which HLS participants had to choose the language they preferred to employ to express each one of them (S represented Spanish, E for English, and S/E for both). These data spreadsheet looked as follows:

Table 3.2

**Sample Spreadsheet of Spanish/English Preference Specific Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Declining invitation</th>
<th>Making a request</th>
<th>Apologizing</th>
<th>...19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEX_HLS 1</td>
<td>S/E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX_HLS 2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/E</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX_HLS 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All four groups filled out demographic surveys providing personal information such as gender, age, occupation and place of origin. These data were also organized using *Microsoft Excel®* spreadsheets.

**Linguistic Tasks**

After reviewing the literature on traditional and pragmatic approaches, it was decided that due to the manner in which the present study had been developed, the analysis of adjective and noun clauses should be done following a more traditional approach. This is not to say that context and pragmatics were not taken into account in this study, in fact, context was taken into consideration when creating the tasks included in this study, what it means is that when reporting the findings of the present study, the more traditional terminology was

---

34 MEX_MONO = Mexican Monolingual  
COL_MONO = Colombian Monolingual  
MEX_HLS = HLS of Mexican descent  
COL_HLS = HLS of Colombian descent
employed. These terms were the following: *volition, lack of existence,* and *impersonal expressions,* and were retained with the purpose of avoiding cumbersome phrasing, and in order to make this work more accessible to all readers.

Terrell and Hooper (1974) designed a widely accepted categorization of the Spanish mood system that at the pedagogical level (at least at the beginners’ level) have been extensively employed. Table 3.3 below contains two of the three sub-categories presented by Terrell and Hooper (1974) namely, the two pertinent to this study relating to noun and adjective clauses (omitting the classification on adverbial clauses).

Table 3.3

*Noun and Adjective Clauses in Spanish*35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic construction</th>
<th>Semantic criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective Clauses</td>
<td>± Existential status of the referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Busco una mujer que tenga dinero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I am looking for a wife that has money” (SUBJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Busco al hombre que es rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I am looking for the guy who is rich” (IND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun Clauses</td>
<td>± Assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– [indirect command] Quiero que lo sepa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I want him to know it” [SUBJ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– [doubt] Dudo que lo sepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I doubt that he knows it” [SUBJ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– [comment] No me gusta que lo sepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I don’t like the fact that he knows.” [SUBJ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ [assertion] Es verdad que los sabe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s true that he knows it.” [IND].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data gathered from the four participant groups (COL_MONOs; MEX_MONOs; COL_HLSs; and MEX_HLSs) were organized per group first, and then statistically analyzed using a Logistic Regression (for the OT and the GJT) and an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the WT. Afterwards, the statistical findings were compared in the following three ways:

1) Amongst HLS groups (i.e., COL_HLSs’ data compared to MEX_HLSs) – to answer Research Questions 1 and 2:

35 The examples and translations in Table 3.3 come from Blake (1985) p. 166.
2) Across country of origin groups (i.e., monolinguals’ data compared to HLSs) – in order to answer Research Questions 3 and 4;

3) Among tasks (OT vs. WT) – to answer Research Question 5;

4) Among monolingual groups (i.e., COL_MONOs’ data compared to MEX_MONOs) – to answer Research Question 6; and

Comparison among HLS Groups

Based on prior research on Spanish HLSs and on the fact that Mexican monolinguals tend to simplify and reduce the use of the subjunctive mood in Spanish (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979), when comparing HLS groups’ results, it was expected that COL_HLSs would score higher in all tasks than their Mexican HLS counterparts. This expectation meant that MEX_HLSs would use the subjunctive mood less often as well as less accurately than their Colombian HLS counterparts; it also meant that instances of subjunctive mood simplification and avoidance would be more common amongst MEX_HLSs than among Colombian HLSs. The comparison among HLS groups was performed in order to determine possible differences between these two groups separately from their monolingual corresponding group, (i.e., determining if either of the two HLS groups presented more instances of Spanish language erosion, or loss; or a stronger English language influence when using their heritage language). This comparison aided in answering questions 1 and 2 in this study: 1) Do Spanish HLSs in the U.S. use the subjunctive mood in Spanish? and 2) Do HLSs recognize obligatory contexts for subjunctive use?

Comparison across Country of Origin Groups

Based on the literature, when comparing across country of origin (Colombia vs. Mexico), the expectation was that monolinguals from Mexico and Colombia would score
higher than their HLS counterparts in all tasks. Special attention was paid to instances of possible simplification, erosion, or loss of the subjunctive mood in the OT, and the WT among participants in all four groups, as well as in their abilities to assess and correct grammatical errors in the GJT. If avoidance of complex grammar morphology were to be found among the HLSs in the present study’s data set it could be explained by either an incomplete acquisition of the Spanish linguistic system (Martínez Mira, 2009; Montrul, 2004, 2002; Valdés, 2001; Silva-Corvalán, 1994, 1994a); or a reduction in use of Spanish language in general (not just the subjunctive mood) which in turn, would decrease the activation threshold (Ecke, 2008) of the whole language system; it would diminish the spontaneity in which they use the language; and last but not least, it would allow for more English influence (Ecke, 2008; Kroll & Stewart, 1994). Comparing across country of origin (Colombia vs. Mexico), helped answer research questions 3 and 4 in this study: 3) Do Spanish MONOs use the subjunctive more than the HLSs? and 4) Are HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish influenced and simplified by their dominant language (English) when compared to the subjunctive use amongst MONOs?

**Comparison among Oral and Written tasks (OT vs. WT)**

The level of intrinsic formality in each of the tasks included in this study determined the order in which the tasks were presented to the participants (from least to most formal and from most open-ended to most focused-on-form). When comparing results among the medium of expression (oral and written) the expectation was that all groups would use the subjunctive more often in writing than in speaking. Due to the OT’s nature; i.e., a spontaneous task in which participants were to answer oral questions in real time (with not much time to think about the way they were constructing their answers), in an open-ended
situation, and where communicating a thought was more immediately needed and important than the focus on form, gave participants more options on how to answer the oral questions, in terms of length of their answers, and the semantic and grammatical choices employed. Even if the WT was similar to the OT in that it was open-ended, participants not only had more time to think about their answers and how to construct them when replying in writing, but the mere fact that they were presented with a written activity was enough to create a more formal environment. Therefore, even though the WT was open-ended, the immediacy of their answer was not as urgent as in the OT, allowing participants time and mental space to think more carefully about the way they were crafting their answers. Comparing medium of expression helped in answering question: 5) Does usage differ by level of focus on formality and form; i.e., speaking vs. writing?

Comparison among Monolingual Groups

Making use of prior documentation about Mexican monolinguals tendency to simplify and reduce the use of the subjunctive mood in Spanish (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979), when comparing monolingual groups the expectation was that MEX_MONOs would score lower than their Colombian monolingual counterparts; because they would have simplified, omitted or avoided the Spanish subjunctive in their completion of the three tasks. This comparison was proposed to verify that “the seeds of change are to be found in the basically monolingual communities of origin” (Silva-Corvalán, 1994, pp. 267-8) and also to determine if there were instances of simplification in the use of the Spanish subjunctive among Colombian Spanish native speakers. Comparing monolinguals made it possible to answer research question: 6) Does HLSs’ usage parallel difference in usage of the subjunctive between Mexican and Colombian monolinguals?
Limitations of the Study

Finding true monolinguals in a university setting in Colombia and Mexico was nearly impossible. Knowledge of languages other than Spanish among Spanish native speakers may affect the validity and reliability of this study’s results because these foreign languages might influence the way they use Spanish. Since finding monolinguals was nearly impossible, those native Spanish speakers who participated in the study might have spoken other languages, but were not bilingual English-Spanish.

Other data gathering methods might have proven more user-friendly, especially for the Spanish-speaking participants. Online tools were of great help in reaching all participants and in particular those abroad without having to travel; however, the language in which these online tools were written created a barrier for non-English speakers, and a language change that was consciously avoided in all communications with the HLSs (i.e., the appearance of English in the online program could be argued to have impacted the use of Spanish by HLSs).
FINDINGS

In this chapter the statistical analyses for the three tasks by task are first presented and explained. Subsequently, the findings are presented by research questions and hypothesized results.

Statistical Analysis

This study’s dataset contained results of the three different Spanish language tasks included in this study (OT, WT, and GJT) and the scores reported on each test for two monolingual and two heritage language speakers’ groups: 10 MEX_MONOs, 10 COL_MONOs, 18 MEX_HLSs, and 18 COL_HLSs, for a total sample size of n=56. Participant groups were described by a combination of two variables. The first variable, called “version of language” referred to the way in which the speaker learned Spanish, i.e., as a monolingual native speaker (MONO) or as a bilingual heritage language speaker (HLS). The second variable, “country of origin” was the speaker’s country of origin (or in the case of some heritage speakers their family’s country of origin), which was either Mexico (MEX) or Colombia (COL).

While each task contained some adjective and some noun clauses, the only task where enough data were collected to examine the clauses separately was the GJT. When determining the differences among the groups, the following scores were employed: OT Total (total number of correct subjunctive usages on the OT, out of a possible 6); WT Total (total score on the 5 WT questions, which was scored so that a maximum score of 10 point per question and a maximum total of 50 points was possible), GJTA Total (total number of correct subjunctive usages with adjective clauses on the GJT, out of a possible 5), and GJTN
Total (total number of correct subjunctive usages with noun clauses on the GJT, out of a possible 18).

Tables 4.1 through 4.4 below present summary statistics for each of the four groups’ four scores – OT, WT, and GJT divided up into two groups GJTA (adjective clauses) and GJTN (noun clauses). The findings presented after Tables 4.1 - 4.4 represent the differences between the present study’s four populations based on two statistical tests (explained below): a Logistic Regression (model 1 below) – used to analyze the OT and the GJTA and GJTN data – and an ANOVA test (model 2 below) – used to analyze the WT data. These statistical tests were implemented in order to determine whether significant differences existed between populations among their average scores on each of the three tasks; and to elucidate if the apparent differences seen in the sample (see Tables 4.1 – 4.4. below) were due to the random nature of the sample, or due to actual differences in the populations.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version of Language</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Proportion(^\text{36})</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONO</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version of Language</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.61</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.06</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONO</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{36}\) The numbers under the “proportion” column in Tables 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 represent the average proportion of questions answered correctly for each group.
Table 4.3

**Summary Statistics for GJTA Total (5 questions total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version of Language</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONO</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4

**Summary Statistics for GJTN Total (18 questions total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version of Language</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONO</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Logistic Regression\(^{37}\) analysis helped examine the probability ‘p’ that an individual would use the subjunctive correctly on any particular occasion, it also compared the proportion of correct answers among all four categories of individuals (when the interaction term was used), and it simultaneously compared the individuals with different versions of language and the individuals with different countries of origin when the interaction term was taken out. Additionally, the logistic regression analysis also allowed me to combine categorical variables (version of language and country of origin). The reason why logistic regression analysis was favored in this study to analyze the data from OT and the GJT, is because it is the statistical approach generally employed in situations where the responses are probabilities ‘p’ between 0 and 1, which stem (in this case) from the way the questions in the OT and the GJT were scored. In the OT and the GJT the answers had one of two possible values 1 (indicating a correct answer) and 0 (indicating an incorrect answer).

\(^{37}\) A logistic regression was employed instead of a t-test because a t-test, like a linear regression or an ANOVA, requires a continuous response. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to analyze binomial data (i.e., right/wrong) using a t-test. Also, a chi-square test was not used because even though it is appropriate for categorical responses (i.e., binomial data), it is difficult to interpret when more than two categories are being compared.
Each term in the model was tested in order to determine whether it was statistically significant for the study; the p-value cutoff was set at \( \leq 0.05 \) (a generally accepted value). The logistic regression model (model 1) used during data analysis of the OT and the GJTA and GJTN was the following:

\[
\ln\left( \frac{p_{ij}}{1 - p_{ij}} \right) = \mu + L_i + C_j + (L_C)_{ij}
\]

In this model \( p_{ij} \) was the average probability that an individual from group \( ij \) would use the subjunctive correctly on any occasion. The remaining elements included in model (1) have the following meaning:

a) \( \ln\left( \frac{p_{ij}}{1 - p_{ij}} \right) \) is a term called the logit of \( p \);

b) \( \mu \) is the overall average logit over all four groups;

c) \( L_i \) is an effect for the version of language of the individual (for HLSs \( i=1 \); and for MONOs \( i=2 \));

d) \( C_j \) is an effect for the country of origin of the individual (for COLs \( j=1 \); and for MEXs \( j=2 \)); and

e) \( (L_C)_{ij} \) is an interaction effect representing any effects beyond the overall for either version of language or country of origin (for COL_HLSs \( ij=(1,1) \); for MEX_HLSs \( ij=(1,2) \); for COL_MONOs \( ij=(2,1) \); and for MEX_MONOs \( ij=(2,2) \)).

The second test employed in the data analysis of the WT was an ANOVA test which aided in the comparison between participant groups to determine whether the average scores of the four groups on the WT (WT Total) were significantly different. The terms included in
Model (2) – explained below – were tested in a similar manner to those in model (1), and also resulted in a \( p\)-value for each term. Model (2) represents the ANOVA test utilized in the WT analysis:

\[
WT\ Total\ ij = \mu + Li + Cj + (LC)ij
\]

In model (2) \( WT\ Total\ ij \) was the average WT Total for an individual from group \( ij \). The elements included in model (2) mean the following:

a) \( \mu \) is the overall average logit over all four groups;

b) \( Li \) is an effect for the version of language of the individual (for HLSs \( i=1 \); and for MONOs \( i=2 \));

c) \( Cj \) is an effect for the country of origin of the individual (for COLs \( j=1 \); and for MEXs \( j=2 \)), and

d) \( (LC)ij \) is an interaction effect representing any effects beyond the overall for either version of language or country of origin (for COL_HLSs \( ij = (1,1) \); for MEX_HLSs \( ij = (1,2) \); for COL_MONOs \( ij =(2,1) \); and for MEX_MONOs \( ij = (2,2) \)).

Next, each task’s analysis is presented individually in the order it was administered to the participants (i.e., OT, WT, and GJT – divided up into 2 subgroups GJTA and GJTN).

**Oral Task (OT)**

The logistic regression analysis was employed to determine whether the probability of using the subjunctive correctly in the OT was related to the version of language and country of origin of an individual. Results of the initial model containing all terms from model (1) are shown in Table 4.5 below.
Table 4.5

*Initial Logistic Regression Results for Oral Task*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 3 Analysis of Effects</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom (DF)</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5176</td>
<td>0.4719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9103</td>
<td>0.0480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.9226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6190</td>
<td>0.2707</td>
<td>5.2295</td>
<td>0.0222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language HLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1587</td>
<td>0.3409</td>
<td>0.2169</td>
<td>0.6414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language MONO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin COL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4797</td>
<td>0.4027</td>
<td>1.4189</td>
<td>0.2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin MEX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country HLS COL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0496</td>
<td>0.5102</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.9226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country HLS MEX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country MONO COL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country MONO MEX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.5, the “Estimate” associated with the “Intercept” represents the average logit of the “baseline” group. The baseline in this case was the MEX_MONO group. This baseline was determined by finding the language and country where the estimate was zero (0). The parameters included in Table 4.5 contained the following information:

1) The Language HLS estimate was the estimate of the effect of being an HLS on the baseline logit; 2) The Country C estimate was the estimate of the effect of being of Colombian origin on the baseline logit; 3) The Language*Country HLS COL estimate was the estimate of the additional effect of being both, i.e., a COL_HLS. In other words, the way in which the logit was estimated for a COL_HLS consisted of adding all the estimates together: 0.6190 (baseline) + 0.1587 (for being an HLS) + 0.4797 (for being a COL) + 0.0496 (for being both COL_HLS) = 0.7499. 


The P-values indicated that there was no significant interaction of version of language and country; which meant that for example, the difference between Colombian HLSs and Colombian monolinguals was the same as the difference between Mexican HLSs and Mexican monolinguals. In order to find out if the term version of language was significant, the interaction term was removed from the model. After doing so, the version of language term was still insignificant (that is, whether the participants were monolinguals or heritage language speakers did not make a difference in the probability of using the subjunctive correctly in the OT), therefore, the best model, shown in Table 4.6, ended up containing only the Country term.

Table 4.6

Best Model for the OT Including Only the Country Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2587</td>
<td>0.0391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7200</td>
<td>0.1644</td>
<td>19.1794</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin COL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5098</td>
<td>0.2471</td>
<td>4.2587</td>
<td>0.0391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin MEX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results showed that the logit for Mexicans (whether monolinguals or HLSs) was 0.7200, and the logit for Colombians (whether monolinguals or HLSs) was 1.2298. The probability of a Mexican (whether monolinguals or HLSs) using the subjunctive correctly in a single instance on the OT was estimated to be 0.672, and the probability of a Colombian (whether monolinguals or HLSs) using the subjunctive correctly in a single instance on the OT was estimated to be 0.774. This means that the only statistically significant difference in the OT was the country of origin, meaning that the probability of a Mexican (whether monolingual or bilingual) of using the subjunctive in the OT was lower than that of the
Colombians (whether monolinguals or HLSs). Therefore, as hypothesized, Colombians (whether monolinguals or HLSs) were found to be significantly more likely (P-value=.0391) to use the Spanish subjunctive mood in the OT than Mexicans (whether monolinguals or HLSs). Version of language (HLS or monolinguals) was not statistically significantly, and therefore did not impact this probability.

The fact that the term version of language was not statistically significant but that country of origin was made me consider other aspects such as metalinguistic awareness, levels of Spanish language education, and the frequency with which participants might come in contact with the different moods (Hislope, 2002; Gutiérrez, 1994). As stated by Martínez Mira (2009) and Silva-Corvalán (2001, 1994, 1991) the infrequent use of certain clauses in conversational Spanish amongst monolinguals, might trigger a reduction in this form’s use amongst HLSs because the “activation threshold” (Ecke, 2008, p. 524) of, for example the subjunctive in Spanish, decreases allowing for more transfer and influence from English (see also Ecke, 2008 on lexical CLI, and Kroll & Stewart, 1994 on word associations). It was expected that HLS participants would be able to use the subjunctive more often and accurately in expressions of volition and lack of existence than when using impersonal expressions due to the frequency in which they are employed by native Spanish speakers. Additionally, it was expected that both HLS groups would use the subjunctive mood in the OT but less often and accurately than the monolinguals which was not the case in the OT results.

Two reasons explicate these contradictory findings; first the lower incidence of subjunctive among Mexican HLSs could be a result of the mood simplification already

---

38 A basic search in the Davis (2002) *Corpus del Español* on volition and lack of existence terms such as *quiero que* and *no hay nadie que* revealed much higher numbers than impersonal expressions such as *es necesario que* and *es importante que*. 
documented among Mexican monolinguals (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979) that is finding its way to the HLS speech as well –i.e., lower frequency in input by native Spanish speakers results in lower frequency of production among HLSs. The second reason points at the overall levels of language education possessed by Mexican HLSs; this level was lower than their Colombian counterparts; which could explain why COL_HLSs scored higher. In other words, the higher level of Spanish education could have helped Colombian HLSs to be better able to use the subjunctive in answering the OT’s questions, tending to use it more frequently than the MEX_HLSs. Next, the WT findings are presented and explicated.

**Written Task (WT)**

In order to determine which factors impacted the average score in the WT (WT Total) an ANOVA test was employed. Results of the initial model containing all terms from model (2) are shown in Table 4.7 below. Table 4.7 shows that the Language*Country interaction was statistically significant in the WT. This statistical significance suggests the need to examine and compare the four groups to one another individually.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares (SS)</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>538.906</td>
<td>179.635</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3355.022</td>
<td>64.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3893.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>Coeff Var</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>WT Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>20.844</td>
<td>8.032</td>
<td>38.536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.929</td>
<td>8.929</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.7114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.478</td>
<td>106.478</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281.335</td>
<td>281.335</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.0417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the four groups were compared to one another individually, the obtained results indicated where significant differences occurred. The first part of Table 4.8 (below) presents the predicted average WT scores for each group; the second part of Table 4.8 shows that the only significant difference in the data for the WT (P-value=.0331) existed between COL_HLSs and MEX_HLSs. In the WT COL_HLSs scored significantly higher on average than MEX_HLSs. No other significant differences in score were found based on version of language or country of origin; only on the combination of the two terms Language*Country. Table 4.8 below presents the significant differences found in the WT:

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version of Language</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>WT Total LSMEAN</th>
<th>LS MEAN Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>42.61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>35.06</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONO</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONO</td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Least Square Means for effect Language*Country
P-values for H0: LSMean(i) = LSMean (j)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i/j</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.0331</strong></td>
<td>0.3141</td>
<td>0.6474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>0.0331</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>0.6212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3141</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6474</td>
<td>0.6212</td>
<td>0.9585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a statistical point of view, some simplification was observed among ALL four groups in the WT results; however, the difference between the two HLS groups was the only concrete one, i.e., the difference between the two HLS groups which was large enough that they could be clearly differentiated from one another. In this study’s sample, when comparing HLSs, Colombian HLSs showed the lowest tendency to simplify the subjunctive mood and Mexican HLSs the highest tendency.
Statistically, the results of the two monolingual groups in the sample did not show any obvious tendencies and their scores were not different when compared to each other. Additionally, the monolinguals’ scores fell between the HLS groups’ scores.

As hypothesized for the Written Task, on average COL_HLSs scored higher than MEX_HLSs; however, no statistically significant differences were found between monolingual groups.

The difference found among HLSs could be attributed to the higher level of Spanish education possessed by the Colombian HLS group as well as this group’s higher tendency to mainly read but also write using the Spanish language when compared to the Mexican HLSs (data taken from the demographic survey). These two elements might have impacted the Colombian HLSs’ results.

With regard to the results of the sample’s monolinguals, the fact that both monolingual groups showed a lower tendency to use the subjunctive accurately in the WT when compared to Colombian HLSs could be explained in three different ways:

1. The first one would be the already explained general tendency to reduce the implementation of the subjunctive among some monolingual groups, which would verify the Mexican tendency and would add a tendency to simplify the subjunctive among Colombians as well.

2. The second explanation relates to time on task, i.e., participants could have been rushing to finish their participation and therefore answered the questions in the fastest way possible, one example would be answering with a list of adjectives instead of a complete sentence.
3. The third possible explanation would be due to a poorly designed written activity in which participants did not feel compelled to use the subjunctive given the questions they received, or due to the low number of questions dealing with the Spanish subjunctive presented to participants in the WT. This could have been the case in the last two questions of the WT (presented next) because the way they were asked the subjunctive was not necessarily obligatory.

Questions 9 and 10 read as follows:

**Question 9:** En oraciones completas, describe por lo menos CINCO características esenciales, indispensables, necesarias o sumamente importantes para obtener este trabajo.
In complete sentences, describe at least FIVE characteristics that you consider essential, indispensable, needed, or extremely important to get the job.

**Question 10:** En oraciones completas, comparte CINCO (como mínimo) consejos, ideas o sugerencias que consideras importantes para el cuidado de tus hijo(s)/a(s).
In complete sentences, at least share FIVE pieces of advice, ideas, or suggestions crucial for your child/ren’s care.

Since in questions 9 and 10 complete sentences were requested as the answer and given that question 9 tried to elicit impersonal expressions such as *ser necesario* and *ser indispensable*, and question 10 requested participants to express suggestions and advice, it was expected that participants’ tendency would be to use the subjunctive when answering them. Among Colombian HLSs, those who did answer in complete sentences, the tendency was to use the subjunctive, and among Mexican HLSs even the complete sentence answers showed a higher level of variation on mood choice. Among monolinguals’ answers for questions 9 and 10, what was found were incomplete sentences, and lists of adjectives, nouns, or infinitives instead of completed statements as was requested in both questions. In order to
illustate the monolingual findings, examples of monolinguals’ answers to questions 9 and 10 are presented next:

Sample answers to Q9:

COL_MONO 1:
Q9: responsabilidad, seriedad, carino, orden, disposicion
(my translation) responsibility, seriousness, love, order, disposition

COL_MONO 2:
Q9: Puntualidad, Delicadeza, Aseada, Responsable, Confianza
(my translation) Punctuality (timeliness), Gentleness, Cleanliness, Responsible, Trustworthy

MEX_MONO 3:
Q9: INTELLIGENTE, RESPETUOSA, EDUCADA, CREATIVA, HONESTA.
(my translation) Intelligent, Respectful, Educated, Creative, Honest

MEX_MONO 4:
Q9: ordenado limpio responzable [sic] inteligente que sepa primeros auxilios honrado puntual
(my translation) organized clean responsible intelligent who knows first aid honest punctual

Sample answers to Q10:

COL_MONO 1:
Q10: no dejarlos solos, prestarles mucha atencion, escucharlos, compartir con ellos, aconsejarlos
(my translation) to not leave them alone, to pay attention to them, to listen to them, to share with them, to advice them

COL_MONO 5:
Q10: admeas [sic] de las de la respuesta anterior, debe ser organizada, cuidar a los ninos como a sus propios hijos.
(my translation) Besides the previous answers, (she) has to be organized, to care for the children the way they care for their own

MEX_MONO 3:
Q10: CUIDAR QUE NO SE META ARTICULOS A LA BOCA, CAMBIAR EL PAÑAL Y VER QUE NO SE ROCE DE LAS POMPIS, DAR LA MAMILA A SUS HORAS, NO DARLE EL CHUPON, MANTENERLO BAÑADO PARA QUE DESCANSE.
(my translation) To insure that (he) does not place items in his mouth, to change diapers and to make sure that (he) does not have a rash, to give the bottle at the right time, to not give (him) the pacifier, to keep (him) clean so he can rest.

MEX_MONO 10:
Q10: tratar de dialogar con ellos para conocerlos preguntarles las cosas que les gustan tratar de platicar conocer sus miedos estar atentos para entender sus necesidades hacer todo con carino no precionarlos
(my translation) to try to dialogue with them to get to know them and to ask them things that they like to try to converse to know their fears to be alert to understand their needs to do everything with love not to pressure them
In the sample answers for Q10 the previously documented increasing tendency to use of infinitives to express general commands or truisms (such as beliefs and rules) among monolinguals was observed (Batchelor & Pountain, 2005). Batchelor and Pountain (2005) explain that when monolinguals use the infinitive form of verbs instead of the expected subjunctive mood their intention is to soften the tone of the statement (i.e., when trying to make a statement more polite or less direct) and this could be the explanation for this preference among some of the monolinguals from both groups. The tendency among HLSs was to answer questions 9 and 10 in complete sentences but the Colombian HLSs employed the subjunctive more often and accurately than their Mexican counterparts.

In summary, so far, for the OT, frequency of use and level of education might explain why Colombian HLSs presented a higher tendency to implement the subjunctive when compared to their Mexican counterparts. For the WT, the explanations as of why Colombian HLSs presented a higher tendency to use the subjunctive in writing when compared to all other groups (monolinguals included) were three: 1) the subjunctive simplification and reduction already observed among Mexican Spanish native speakers; 2) time-on-task, i.e., the amount of time spent in writing the answers; and 3) the open-ended manner in which the last two questions of the WT were written, might have led to a lower use of the subjunctive when participants answered them. When compared only to Mexican HLS, the reason why Colombian HLSs tended to use the subjunctive more often and accurately than the Mexican HLSs could be due to the level of Spanish education possessed by the Colombian HLSs, as well as their higher tendency to read and write in their heritage language. Next, the GJT analysis, divided up into two sub-groups (GJTA and GJTN) is presented.
Grammaticality Judgment Task (GJT)

A logistic regression was utilized to analyze the GJT; which, for analysis purposes was divided up into two sub-groups Adjective Clauses or GJTA (presented below first) and Noun Clauses or GJTN presented afterwards.

Grammaticality Judgment Task Adjective Clauses (GJTA)

A logistic regression was employed in order to determine whether the probability of using the subjunctive correctly on the GJTA was related to the version of language, the country of origin of an individual, or a combination of both terms. Results of the initial model containing all terms from model (1) are shown next in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9

Initial Logistic Regression Results for GJTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.9369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>0.9426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.9443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.9592</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>0.9268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language</td>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>-11.3201</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>0.9406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>-10.7811</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.9434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>10.6150</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.9443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimates in Table 4.9 for Version of Language, Country of Origin, and Language*Country were interpreted as in Table 4.5, in which the “Estimate” associated with the “Intercept” represented the average logit of the “baseline” group. Once again, the
baseline was the MEX_MONOs; the baseline was determined by finding the version of language and country of origin where the estimate is zero (0).

The parameters employed in Table 4.9 are the following: 1) The Version of Language H estimate is the estimate of the effect of being an HLS on the baseline logit; 2) The Country of Origin C estimate is the estimate of the effect of being of Colombian origin on the baseline logit; 3) The Language*Country HLS COL estimate is the estimate of the additional effect of being both a COL_HLS.

The logit for the COL_HLSs was determined by adding all the estimates together:
13.9592 (baseline) - 11.3201 (for being an HLS) - 10.7811 (for being of Colombian origin) + 10.6150 (for being both a COL_HLS) = 2.473).

The results showed that p-values of all effects were extremely large (i.e., very close to one) so none of these differences were considered statistically significant; therefore it was decided to implement backward elimination, which means that terms, starting with the least significant, were removed. Backward elimination did not reveal any statistically significant terms; which indicates that there was no statistical difference between any of the groups on the GJTA, and so the best model for the GJTA became the intercept-only model shown in Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8717</td>
<td>0.2654</td>
<td>117.0715</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 shows that the logit was estimated to be 2.8717 for all groups, and neither term: Version of Language, Country of Origin, nor any combination of the two changed the
probability of using the subjunctive correctly in a single instance. To determine the estimate of that probability itself, $p$ was determined algebraically using the following model (3):

$$\ln\left(\frac{p}{1 - p}\right) = 2.8717 \Rightarrow p = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-2.8717}} = 0.946$$

Model (3) estimated the overall probability of this population using the subjunctive correctly, regardless of version of language or country of origin, to be $p=0.946$. Even though no statistical difference was found among the four groups, it does not necessarily indicate that there are no differences among the population on the basis of Version of Language or Country of Origin for the GJTA, but could most likely be the result of a small sample sizes in each group, combined with the fact that this determination was made on the basis of five questions per person.

In conclusion, the combination of low numbers in the sample with low numbers of adjective clauses in the GJT resulted in a lack of statistical difference in the participants’ answers.

Grammaticality Judgment Task Noun Clauses (GJTN)

A logistic regression was also employed with the GJTN to determine whether the probability of using the subjunctive correctly in this task was related to the Version of Language, the Country of Origin of an individual, or a combination of both terms. Results of the initial model containing all terms from model (1) are shown in Table 4.11 below.

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Logistic Regression Results for GJTN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The estimates for Version of Language, Country of Origin, and the combination of terms Language*Country have similar interpretations as in Table 4.9; however, in Table 4.11 the p-values for the effects of Version of Language and Language*Country were significant. Since the interaction effect was significant, the effects of each group were examined separately to determine which groups were statistically different from one another. Table 4.12 below shows the model’s estimated logits for each group, and the associated probabilities (calculated again as in model (3) above).

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8332</td>
<td>0.3254</td>
<td>75.8115</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.5982</td>
<td>0.3515</td>
<td>20.6717</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version of Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0986</td>
<td>0.3866</td>
<td>8.0756</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4293</td>
<td>0.4344</td>
<td>10.8239</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine which groups were statistically significantly different from one another, the differences between each of the possible combinations were tested. The comparisons in Table 4.13 below were of particular interest.
Tests that demonstrate significance compared to a p-value cutoff of 0.0125 are those shown in bold in Table 4.13 above. The adjustment from 0.05 to 0.0125 was used because it was considered that the probability of making a mistake would increase in doing several statistical tests at one time (i.e., comparing the four groups to one another). When a 0.05 cutoff is used, it means that if there are no differences between the study’s populations as a whole, there is a 5% chance that the random samples of individual participant could mistakenly show some significant differences which would result in making the wrong conclusions. The Bonferroni adjustment, used in this study, instructs to divide the .05 cutoff by the number of tests being carried out—in this case four tests—(.05/4 = 0.0125). This is very conservative, but it guaranteed there would not be higher than a 5% chance of making a mistake overall.

The findings for the GJTN were the following:

a) MEX_MONOs displayed the highest probability of using the subjunctive correctly on the GJTN (significantly higher than all other groups);

b) MEX_HLSs displayed a lower probability than MEX_MONOs of correctly using the subjunctive on the GJTN but this probability was higher than either of the Colombian groups;

c) COL_MONOs showed a significantly lower probability than either Mexican group (whether monolingual or heritage) of using the subjunctive correctly on the GJTN;
d) COL_HLSs showed the lowest probability of using the subjunctive correctly in the GJTN.

The findings for GJTN contradict the tendency found so far in the other two tasks (i.e., a higher tendency among Colombians (whether monolinguals or heritage) to use the subjunctive mood. The fact that the GJTN tests a receptive skill might have impacted the way this study’s participants used the language. What these results suggest is that Mexicans (from both groups) are able to tap their metalinguistic knowledge more readily than their Colombian counterparts. Knowledge of a third language was raised as a possible reason for a more acute metalinguistic awareness among Mexican HLSs but the demographic information provided by both HLS groups shows that more Colombian HLSs had taken foreign languages than Mexican HLSs although all Mexican HLSs had taken Romance Languages and Colombian HLSs had knowledge of Asian as well as Romance Languages. This last difference could have impacted the metalinguistic knowledge among those MEX_HLS participants who had taken foreign languages increasing their ability to not only recognize errors but also to correct them.

From a statistical view point, in the oral task (OT), Country of Origin was determined as the only variable impacting the probability of using the subjunctive correctly. Both Colombian groups were significantly more likely to do so when compared to the Mexican groups. The Language*Country interaction was the only statistically significant term in the WT. Monolinguals did not show significant differences between each other; but HLSs did. COL_HLSs had a higher tendency to employ the subjunctive mood in writing and consequently scored significantly higher on average than MEX_HLSs. The GJTA shed no statistically significant differences in the probability of using the subjunctive correctly based
on any of the considered terms: Version of Language, Country of Origin, or their combination Language*Country; and in the GJTN, Mexican monolinguals showed a significantly higher probability of using the subjunctive correctly than any other group, and Colombian monolinguals presented a significantly lower probability of using the subjunctive correctly than all other groups except for Colombian HLSs. Each task analyzed in the present study varied from each other, especially the production tasks when compared to the reception task. These tasks did not entirely support the hypotheses/expectations (a-g) as originally proposed in Table 3.1 above. Below, Table 4.14 summarizes the findings for all tasks (three total) and participant groups (four total) including only the significant term for each task:

Table 4.14

*Summary of Study’s Findings for the Three Tasks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Statistically Significant Term</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>Colombians (whether monolinguals or HLSs) produced the subjunctive mood more often than Mexicans (whether monolinguals or HLSs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>Language*Country</td>
<td>COL_HLSs scored significantly higher than MEX_HLSs. No other significant differences were found based on version of language or country of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT</td>
<td>GJTA</td>
<td>No significant differences were found among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJTN</td>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>Mexicans (whether monolinguals or HLSs) disclosed a higher probability of using subjunctive correctly than Colombians (whether monolinguals or HLSs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Cases**

When studying the overall totals of all the items in all three tasks, a few overall totals were very low when compared to other items in the same task. Additionally, in one GJT item an archaic form crept in among HLSs but was not produced by any of the monolinguals.
who participated in the present study. In this section all of these special cases are discussed individually in an attempt to explain their seeming irregularity. They are discussed by task:

a) OT – items (5) and (6);

b) WT – item (6); and

c) GJT – items (16), (19), (21)\(^{39}\), (24), and (27).

**Items 5 and 6 (OT)**

Item (5) read:

(5) Describe por lo menos 3 características esenciales o indispensables que esta persona debe tener para poder trabajar con tus hijos.

Describe a minimum of 3 essential or indispensable characteristics that the babysitter must have in order to work with your children.

Item (6) read:

(6) Comparte por lo menos 3 consejos que el niñero o la niñera va a recibir de nuestra agencia antes de comenzar a trabajar con tus hijos.

Share a minimum of three pieces of advice that our agency will relay to the babysitter before she begins to work with your children.

In items (5) and (6) of the OT participants from all four groups omitted the use of the subjunctive mood in their replies leading to an overall low score for these two questions for all groups. Item (5) intended to elicit impersonal expressions\(^{40}\) (Terrell & Hooper, 1974) from participants, and item (6), advice. The contexts found in questions (5) and (6) would require the use of the subjunctive (i.e., make it obligatory). For both items participants were expected to employ the Spanish subjunctive mood; however, given that this study’s items were designed so as not to guide participants’ answers, in other words, these questions were written in such an open-ended manner that allowed participants to use a variety of tenses and moods; the result was a variety of tenses, moods, and other forms utilized to answer these questions.

---

\(^{39}\) Item (21) will be presented separately at the end.

\(^{40}\) Called “evaluative clauses” by Haverkate (2002)
It also probable that due to the use of an impersonal expression in item (5) – a form less commonly employment among monolinguals–, when having the option, participants chose to answer in ways that did not implementing the subjunctive mood.

In conclusion, the manner in which these two OT items were designed did not compel participants to employ the subjunctive mood; however, it is also true that these two items are not examples of exceptions or oddities within the subjunctive use among monolinguals or HLSs, but represent a possible flaw in the way the tool was crafted. The next item to be presented and explicated is item (6) of the WT:

**Item (6) (WT)**

Item (6) in the WT read:

(6) ¿Qué tipo de persona buscas?
What kind of person are you looking for?

Item (6) in the WT was designed to elicit adjective clauses making reference to something that does not exist from the point of view of the speaker also known as lack of existence\(^{41}\) (Terrell and Hooper, 1974). Based on the question asked in item (6) of the WT participants were expected to implement the subjunctive mood in their replies because they were asked to share the characteristics they were looking for in the nanny who they did not know (i.e., unknown to the speaker). As was the case with items (5) and (6) in the OT, the manner in which item (6) of the WT was written, gave participants myriad options to express their answers. In fact, participants chose to answer question (6) with single nouns or adjectives, strings of words, and lists of adjectives, and nouns instead of complete sentences (as stated in the tasks’ instructions). However, as we have seen in this study, this instance does not represent participants’ knowledge or ability to employ the subjunctive in statements.

---

\(^{41}\) Described by Guitart (1995) as: one or more unspecified member(s) of a class presented as a pending situation; and by Haverkate (2002) as describing something that has a potential existence in a virtual world.
indicating lack of existence. Once again, the paucity of grammatical direction in item (6) of the WT allowed participants to choose from a great variety of possible answers, moods, tenses, and formats, therefore producing understandable language but not using the subjunctive mood as I had intended.

The next items to be presented and explicated come from the GJT, and are item (19) form the GJTA, and items (16), (21), (24), and (27) from the GJTN.

*Items 19 (GJTA), and 16, 21, 24, and 27 (GJTN)*

In the statistical analysis of the GJT, item (19) within GJTAs (presented first), and items (16), (21), (24), and (27) among the GJTNs’ overall totals were very low when compared to other items in the same task. Next, these items are discussed and explained individually.

**Item (19) – GJTA**

The adjective clause included in item (19) was an evaluative statement stated incorrectly with the purpose of eliciting a correction employing the subjunctive mood. The original format of item (19) in the GJT read as follows:

(19) *En la casa es necesario que sus hijos *sacan la basura una vez por semana, pero ellos se niegan a hacerlo.*
At home it is necessary that her children *take out [IND] the trash once a week, but they refuse to do it.

The expected change was the following:

(19a) *En la casa es necesario que sus hijos saquen la basura una vez por semana, pero ellos se niegan a hacerlo.*
At home it is necessary that her children *take out [SUBJ] the trash once a week, but they refuse to do it.*
Item (19) contained the most common evaluative matrix employed in this GJT “es necesario que$^{42}$ ....” High percentages of rejection were expected for it among this study’s monolinguals as well as HLSs participants. However, results showed that although both monolingual groups rejected item (19) in their majority (1 in 20 participants = 5% accepted item (19) as originally stated), and the rest (19/20 participants = 95%) rejected it and restated it employing the subjunctive mood (as expected); among HLSs the number of participants who accepted the original statement was higher – six MEX_HLSs (33% – out of 18 participants) and five COL_HLSs (28% – out of 18 participants) – which combined accounts for 11 out of the 36 HLS participants = 31%.

From a pragmatic stance, it was expected that Spanish users would employ the subjunctive to express the message in item (19) because it conveyed a need that had not been met at the time the statement was expressed and that may never be met. This uncertainty could only be expressed employing the subjunctive mood. The unexpected HLSs’ acceptance of the indicative mood in item (19), when compared to their monolingual counterparts, presented the possibility that some HLSs’ conceptualization of the subjunctive’s use and their feel for the role of the subjunctive mood in these types of expressions (evaluative clauses) had become simplified. This reduction in subjunctive use may have been a direct result of lack of exposure to these types of expressions (during and after Spanish language acquisition), coupled with an incomplete Spanish subjunctive mood system among HLSs.

A second possible explanation for the high levels of acceptance among HLSs of item (19) in its original indicative format could point to the detrimental effect that according to Oh and Au (2005) GJT have on HLSs. As a reminder, these scholars have explained that HLSs

$^{42}$ Found 474 times in use with the subjunctive mood in Spanish in the Davis (2002) Corpus del Español.
might be able to produce language syntactically, morphologically, phonetically, and semantically comparable to that of monolinguals, but when asked to evaluate statements the same HLSs are less able to parallel their language use to native speakers of their heritage language. As seen in the statistical analysis of the GJT, Oh and Au’s (2005) observation seemed to have been validated with regard Colombian HLSs’ who scored the lowest amongst all four groups. However, the GJT did not seem to affect Mexican HLSs; in fact, it seemed to be the only task that actually made sense to Mexican HLSs who scored second, lower than Mexican monolinguals but significantly higher than both groups of Colombians. Next, the GJTNs (16), (21), (24), and (27) are individually reviewed and explained.

**Item (16) – GJTN**

The noun clause included in item (16) was a volitional statement stated incorrectly with the intention of eliciting the use of the subjunctive mood in the participants’ correction of the verb *dormir* (to sleep) from the indicative form provided in the item, to the subjunctive mood (*duermen* → *duerman*). The original format of item (16) in the GJT read as follows:

(16) *La señora López quiere que sus hijos no *duermen* en clase.*

Mrs. López wants that her children do to sleep [IND] in class.

The expected change was the following:

(16a) *La señora López quiere que sus hijos no duerman en clase.*

Mrs. López wants that her children do to sleep [SUBJ] in class.

Acceptance of the erroneous version of item (16) among monolinguals could be interpreted as either distraction, or mood reduction not only transpiring – as already documented – among Mexican monolinguals\(^\text{43}\) (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas

\(^{43}\) Different from Gutiérrez’s (1994) findings, which indicated a variation of subjunctive use depending on age group, in this particular example age did not seem to be a relevant variable in the acceptance of the indicative in item (16) among COL_MONOs because COL_MONO1 was 21 years-old at the time of the study and COL_MONO4 was 46.
Anadón, 1979), but also among Colombian monolinguals, which was a situation documented not only in the GJTNs, but also in the WT.

For HLSs, accepting the incorrect version of item (16) could have different implications. First, it could mean that these HLSs were exposed to and adopted simplified versions of desiderative clauses with *querer* from monolinguals, or that they did not finish acquiring the subjunctive mood, showing inconsistencies (as it was also seen in item (19) above) in their judgments of grammar. Accepting item (16) among HLSs could also mean that their dominant language (English) was syntactically influencing their less dominant language (Spanish). The latter is based on the premise that in daily use in English the subjunctive is not employed in desiderative clauses employing the verb *to want*. A final possible explanation as of why some HLSs accepted item (16) in its original form, is that although they knew the answer they were distracted when working with this particular item which led them to choose the incorrect answer.

A final observation about item (16) is the verb contained in it. *Dormir* ‘to sleep’ is a stem-changing verb in Spanish. A *stem-changing verb* means that when conjugated in some tenses in both moods, the first vowel “o” changes to “ue”, i.e., from *dormir* (infinitive) to *yo duermo* ‘I sleep’ in the presents indicative and *yo duermga* in the present subjunctive. From a morphological perspective, the present indicative and the present subjunctive forms of this verb are almost identical: *duermga* [IND] *duerman* [SUBJ]; therefore, it could be argued that the proximity between these two forms may have confused participants in the HLS groups, but it is not believed to be an acceptable explanation as of why monolinguals accepted the indicative mood in item (16). Next, item (24) is discussed and explained.
Item (24) – GJTN

The clause in item (24) was an impersonal expression volitional statement designed to be judged as incorrect. It contained an embedded clause requiring the subjunctive mood in each of the dependent clauses. Participants were to change two verbs: 

- permitir ‘to allow’
- volver ‘to return’

from the provided indicative mood to the subjunctive. The first modification, permitir to permita was expected because in item (24) the language user states a subjective perspective is considered to be an important characteristic of the program, which is not asserted because it might not be found among available programs. The second modification volver to vuelvan was due to the verb of influence permitir.

The original format of item (24) in the GJT read as follows:

(24) También es importante que el programa no *permite que los chicos *vuelven temprano.

It is also important that the program do not allow [IND] children to return [IND] home early.

Item (24) was corrected in several different ways by participants. The most popular change amongst all four groups was the expected double mood change (24a) presented next:

(24a) También es importante que el programa no permita que los chicos vuelvan temprano.

It is also important that the program do not allow [SUBJ] children to return [SUBJ] home early.

The second most popular change to item (24), (24b), was the modification of the second verb volver (vuelven to vuelvan) but not the first one:

(24b) También es importante que el programa no *permite que los chicos vuelvan temprano.

---

44 Nine MEX_MONOs (90%); six COL_MONOs (60%); 11 MEX_HLSs (61%); and eight COL_HLSs (44%) modified both verbs in item (24).
45 Two COL_MONOs (20%); one MEX_HLS (6%); and three COL_HLSs (17%).
It is also important that the program do not allow [IND] children to return [SUBJ] home early.

In order to express that the characteristic of the program (not allowing children to return early) is unknown to the speaker the verb *permitir* must take the subjunctive mood; and so should the verb *volver* since the verb of influence *permitir* is affecting it. It is possible that the emphasis was placed on what should not be allowed, i.e., that children do not return early form the program (which would explain why the verb *volver* was modified but not the verb *permitir*). However, it seems unusual that participants in the subject pool did not notice the error on *permitir* when correcting and re-writing item (24). A search in the Davis (2002) *Corpus del Español* showed that *permitir que* and *permita que* are more commonly employed by Spanish native speakers than the evaluative clause *es importante que*⁴⁶; therefore, it is possible that participants focused their attention on *permitir* and its pragmatic effect on the message sent by item (24) than on the evaluative clause.

The third observed modification to item (24)⁴⁷, (24c), presented the expected change in the first verb (*permitir*) as expected, because this term was influenced by the evaluative clause that preceded it. However, the change expected in the second verb (*volver*) which was affected by the intention of expressing permission which indicates influence from one entity to a second entity in the phrase (in this case, the need for the program to not allow children to return early), did not take place. The third documented modification to item (24) read as follows:

(24c) *También es importante que el programa no permita que los chicos *vuelven* temprano.

---

⁴⁶ *Permitir que* and *permita que* were found 297 times and 47 times respectively, in conjunction with the subjunctive mood, and the expression *es importante que* was found 62 times.
⁴⁷ One MEX_MONO (10%); one MEX_HLS (6%); and two COL_HLSs (11%) modified only the first verb in item (24).
It is also important that the program do not allow [SUBJ] children to return [IND] home early.

One Mexican monolingual\(^{48}\) seemed to have noticed and considered the second verb because he changed it from “volver” to “regresar,” however he retained the indicative mood in the second dependent clause. This participant’s correction is pragmatically unexplainable therefore his choice suggests one of two options: a case of subjunctive reduction already documented among Mexican monolinguals (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979); or a distraction when he was in the process of write the correction for item (24) resulting in him not making the mood change, but still managing to make a lexical change. This case presents a situation of distraction, more than a previously stated subjunctive simplification, could be the only possible explanation to their choice.

With regard to the HLSs, (24c) could conceivably be connected to a lack of attention, i.e., these participants did not notice or paid attention to the second part of item (24) when reading it, and when re-writing it the second error did not become apparent. It is worthy of note that these three participants re-wrote the complete sentence when making the changes (i.e., some participants, instead of re-writing the complete sentences just re-wrote the sections that were incorrect).

Item (24) gave way to a final modification which did not align at all with the GJT expectations. This correction was suggested by a Colombian monolingual\(^{49}\) who judged item (24) as incorrect (as expected), but did not make any grammatical corrections to it, instead he made a comment about the content of item (24):

\[
(24d) \text{es muy cuidadosa con sus hijos, no permitiría que se trsnocharan [sic].}
\]

\(^{48}\) MEX MONO 10.  
\(^{49}\) COL MONO 10.
[Mrs. López] cares deeply about her children; therefore she would not allow them to stay up [SUBJ] all night.

Statistical analyses do not leave room for these kinds of answers. It is clear, based on this participant’s subjunctive use in all three tasks, that he is able to use the subjunctive when needed. However, in this case, this participant either did not understand what was expected of him, was tired when he arrived to item (24), or got distracted and tired of correcting and decided to comment on the item instead. Next, item (27) is discussed and explained.

Item (27) – GJTN

Item (27) was the last statement in the GJT. The message conveyed in this item is one of unmet need; i.e., someone should teach Mrs. López’s children a lesson, in which the person who should teach the lesson is not specified by the speaker. This lack of specificity in item (27) should have led most Spanish monolinguals and Spanish HLSs to use the subjunctive mood when expressing it. The original format of item (27) in the GJT read as follows:

(27) ¡Ellos necesitan que alguien les *da una lección!
They need someone to teach [IND] them a lesson!

From a total of 56 participants, 16\(^{50}\) accepted the indicative mood in item (27), i.e., an 18% of the total number of participants. The remaining 40 participants out of 56\(^{51}\) (71%) rejected item (27)’s original form in the indicative mood, and corrected it using the subjunctive mood (as expected):

(27a) ¡Ellos necesitan que alguien les dé una lección!
They need someone to teach [SUBJ] them a lesson!

\(^{50}\) Two COL_MONOs (20%); eight MEX_HLSs (44%); and six COL_HLSs (33%).
\(^{51}\) 10 COL_MONOs (100%); eight COL_MONOs (80%); 10 MEX_HLSs (56%) and 12 COL_HLSs (67%)
Of the 40 participants who made the change from indicative *da* to subjunctive *dé*, only three\(^{52}\) placed an accent over the “e” in *dé*. This is important because when the present subjunctive form or *dar* → *dé* is presented in context (as it was here) this accent, although necessary, can be omitted without changing the meaning of the statement. However, when presented in isolation, the accent becomes crucial in helping with the differentiation between the subjunctive form of *dar* (to give) *dé* from the preposition *de* (of/from) in Spanish.

*Dar* (to give) is a commonly employed verb in Spanish; however, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, it contains a small irregularity in the first person singular, namely the use of an accent mark in the first person of the present subjunctive. As a consequence of the latter, two possible explanations to the high number of acceptance of the indicative in item (27) among HLS participants (14 out of 36) emerge: the first one is due to fatigue; item (27) was the last statement of the last task in this study. It could be argued (although not proved) that participants’ attention spans had declined at this point, which prompted them to accept the incorrect form in item (27). A second possibility is that since the indicative form *da* is almost identical, morphologically speaking, to *de* (without the accent, which is the form provided by 37 of the 40 participants who corrected item (27)), participants did not notice the error.

Worthy of note, however, is that Mexican monolinguals rejected item (27) unanimously, whereas two Colombian monolinguals (out of 10) accepted it in its original indicative format. Acceptance of item (27) in its original form could denote a tendency among Colombian monolinguals to reduce the use of the subjunctive in certain clauses or a mere lack of attention or fatigue.

\(^{52}\) Two COL_MONOs and one COL_HLS.
Item (21) was selected because in it presented an archaic form in the Spanish subjunctive of HLSs and not because its overall score was lower. Next, (21) is studied, discussed, and explained.

**Item (21) – GJTN**

Item (21) is studied as a particular example due to an occurrence found only among HLSs that raised particular interest, namely the use of the archaic form of the present subjunctive form of the verb haber – *haya*. In item (21) of the GJT participants were expected to judge it as incorrect and to modify it from its present indicative original form *hay* (there is/are) to its subjunctive form *haya*. Item (21) in its original form presented to participants read as follows:

(21) *La Sra. López quiere que *hay paz en su casa. Está harta de los problemas con sus hijos.*
Mrs. López wants [(that there is) IND] peace at home. She is fed up with her children’s problems.

All Mexican monolinguals (n=10) and nine out of 10 of the Colombian monolinguals rejected item (21) and changed it (as expected) from the present indicative form of haber: *hay* to its irregular form in the present subjunctive: *haya*. However, among the corrections provided by the HLSs (mainly among Mexican HLSs) an archaic form of *haya* was documented. Table 4.15 below contains the two documented spelling versions of the archaic form on *haber* in the present subjunctive *haya* by HLS group and by occurrence:

---

53 The COL_MONO (COL_MONO 10) who accepted item (21) in its original indicative mood seemed to have misunderstood the purpose of GJT.
Table 4.15

**MEX HLSs and COL HLSs Two Variations of ‘haya’ Spelling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different forms of the present subjunctive of haber: <em>haya</em></th>
<th>MEX_HLSs (n=18) (total and percentages per version)</th>
<th>COL_HLSs (n=18) (total and percentages per version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>haiga</em>(^54) (archaic/non-standard form)</td>
<td>8/18 (44%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hayga</em> (misspelled archaic/non-standard)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/18 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the archaic versions of *haber → haiga*\(^55\) in the present subjunctive form was used by eight Mexican HLSs (n=18). The non-standard version of *haiga* was produced by a Colombian HLS (n=18) who spelled it *hayga*. The version *haiga* is an archaic form of *haber* in the present subjunctive, which according to Rosado (2005) is still employed amongst Spanish-speakers in Texas, but as found in the Davis (2002) *Corpus del Español* not very common in monolingual spoken Spanish. A post-hoc poll of Mexican and Colombian nationals revealed that *haiga* is a stigmatized form of the verb *haber* considered uneducated and usually connected to low socio-economic status (SES). Demographic data gathered via the HLSs demographic surveys did not point to any similar thread that could explicate the employment of *haiga/hayga* among the nine HLSs who employed it in this study. These participants’ backgrounds were varied, i.e., four Mexican HLSs had studied in Mexico for at least one year at the elementary school level and the other four had taken Spanish courses in the U.S. at levels varying from elementary and middle school, to high-school and college. Two MEX_HLSs were born in Mexico and then moved to California by age 10; four were born and raised in Georgia; and one was born in Mexico, and moved to Texas by age eight.

This participant is the only one who, according to Rosado (2005), could be said to have been

\(^{54}\) *Haiga/hayga* – MEX_HLSs 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 18; and COL_HLS5.

\(^{55}\) The form *haiga* was found in the Davis (2002) *Corpus del Español* 55 times, although only four uses had been documented in oral forms in Habla Culta: Havana – one instance; Habla Culta: Lima – one instance; Habla Culta: La Paz – one instance; and España Oral – one instance; and 51 in literary uses of the language.
influenced by the community where he was brought up. The Colombian HLS who used *hayga* was born and raised in New York City and took Spanish classes from elementary school to college only in the U.S. In conclusion, what these demographic data disclosed was that neither place of birth, place of residence, level of Spanish education, nor source of education (formal vs. informal) made a difference when it was time for these nine HLSs employed the verb *haber* in the present subjunctive. It could be expected that through formal Spanish education HLSs would have come into contact and learned that the present subjunctive form for *haber* is *haya* and not *haiga*, however, taking Spanish classes in the U.S., abroad, or in both settings did not seem to affect the choice and implementation of the archaic *haiga* among these nine HLSs, nor did it guarantee its correction. No cases of *haiga* were documented among monolinguals.

However, HLSs’ retention of this particular archaic form still points at the environment in which they learned the language which might have maintained one or more archaic forms of the language. No demographic data regarding HLS parents’ SES or levels of education were gathered therefore it cannot be ascertained that the use of *haiga* by these HLSs is a result of parents’ low levels of education or low SES.

**Findings Presented by Research Question**

The first research question (1) *Do Spanish HLSs in the U.S. use the subjunctive mood in Spanish?* dealt with the employment of the subjunctive mood exclusively among HLSs. Before gauging erosion, simplification, and avoidance, it was important to determine if HLSs used the subjunctive mood at all. The expectation was that HLSs would use the subjunctive in Spanish. It was also expected that they would use it less often and consistently than monolingual with which they were compared; in other words, a higher level of mood
simplification, which meant lower scores in the three tasks, was expected among HLSs. Based on the statistical analysis of the data collected for the present study, the answer to question (1) is yes. In the present study, HLSs did use the subjunctive mood in Spanish when speaking, and writing, and were able to judge and provide the corrected forms of incorrect phrases where the indicative was provided and the subjunctive mood was needed.

The second research question (2) Do HLSs recognize obligatory contexts for subjunctive use? took into consideration the ability among HLSs to recognize the need to implement the subjunctive mood, as well as their capacity to use the subjunctive mood in structured as well as in freer linguistic production. The expectation for this question was that both HLS groups would be more capable of recognizing the need for subjunctive than to produce it, which means that it was expected that each HLS group would score higher in the GJT than in either of the production tasks. Based on the statistical analysis of the data collected for the present study, the answer to question (2) is ‘yes’ for MEX_HLSs and ‘no’ for COL_HLSs. Mexican HLSs scored higher than Colombian HLSs in the recognition task (GJT). Whereas MEX_HLSs seemed to be able to recognize correct as well as incorrect uses of the subjunctive mood and correct them when necessary; Colombian HLSs seemed less able to do so especially in the GJT noun clauses (GJTNs) – Colombian HLSs received the lowest score in the recognition task (GJTN) not only when compared to their own scores in the other two tasks, but also when compared to their HLS counterparts, and to the monolingual groups as well. In free production, however, Mexican HLSs scored lower than their Colombian counterparts. The latter demonstrates the ability of Colombian HLSs to use the subjunctive mood in obligatory contexts when speaking and writing, but having a lesser metalinguistic awareness.
The third research question (3) **Do Spanish MONOs use the subjunctive more than the HLSs?** was directed at the explicit comparison between Version of Language. For this question the expectation was that HLSs would employ the subjunctive less often and accurately than the monolingual participants because it was anticipated that a unidirectional transfer would manifest itself through a subtle encroachment of the HLSs dominant language (English) on their less dominant language (Spanish) (Marian & Kaushanskaya, 2007; Odlin, 1989). Based on the statistical analysis of the data for the present study, the answer to question (3) is no, Spanish monolinguals did not use the subjunctive mood more often or accurately than HLSs. In the OT both Colombian groups (monolinguals and HLSs) scored higher which shows an increased tendency among Colombians to use the subjunctive mood in oral expression when compared to their Mexicans counterparts (monolinguals as well as HLSs). In the WT, Colombian HLSs scored higher than any of the other three groups (both monolingual groups and MEX_HLS) because in giving complete answers to the WT questions they received a higher overall score. With regard to the GJT, in the GJTA no statistically significant difference was found between any of the four groups probably due to the low number of questions including adjective clauses (five questions per participant). The only tasks that showed a higher score for monolinguals and only for Mexican monolinguals, was the GJTN which showed an increased use of subjunctive among Mexican monolinguals. The Colombian monolingual group had the lowest probability of using the subjunctive mood in the GJTN other than the Colombian HLSs who had the very lowest probability of using the subjunctive mood in the GJTN. Mexican HLSs had the second highest score.

The fourth research question (4) **Are HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish influenced and simplified by their dominant language (English) when compared to the subjunctive use**
amongst MONOs? expected to find that both HLS groups would use the subjunctive mood but not as often or as consistently as the monolingual groups (i.e., more mood simplification was expected among HLSs). HLSs’ mood choices in Spanish were expected to be influenced by their dominant language (English), and simplified when compared to monolinguals’ mood choices especially in highly used constructions such as volition querer ‘to want’ with a change of subject (influence) where the English language does not need a mood change. In other words, preferential use of the indicative where the Spanish subjunctive would have been used by monolingual speakers but indicative would have been preferred in the English system was also expected in HLS production. Additionally, it was expected that within the HLS groups, the Mexican HLSs would use the subjunctive less often and accurately than their COL_HLSs counterparts due to the subjunctive simplification found among Mexican monolingual (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979). Based on the statistical analysis of the data collected for the present study, the answer to question (4) is no, the simplification observed among HLSs did not seem to be a consequence of their dominant language (English) but rather a result of: first, the task being completed (OT, WT, GJT); and secondly, what seems to be related to the models of language acquired during their Spanish learning process. Although simplification was found among HLSs; cases of simplification, avoidance, omission, and erosion were also observed among monolinguals. The latter suggests that the simplification phenomenon is not a result of a dominant language encroaching on a less used or less dominant language, but a consequence of the linguistic models HLSs had during their Spanish language acquisition. With regard to HLSs, in this study it was expected to find an encroachment of the English mood system (i.e., HLSs’ dominant language) upon the Spanish mood system (less dominant); not only due to the
influence that the dominant language could have over the less dominant one but also due to the Spanish mood system’s permeability (Silva-Corvalán, 1986). It was anticipated that this encroachment (Marian & Kaushanskaya, 2007; Odlin, 1989) would be evinced by the use of either a lower percentage of subjunctive amongst HLSs when compared to monolinguals, or a different use of the Spanish mood system when performing the three different tasks for this study. Additionally, it was expected that HLSs would produce more cases of overgeneralization (Meisel, 1983) when compared to the monolingual groups; which would be revealed by an HLS tendency to employ the indicative mood even in realms where the subjunctive would have been preferred by their monolingual counterparts.

Research question (5) *Does usage differ by level of focus on formality and form; i.e., speaking vs. writing?* expected that the written medium, with its higher level of formality, would invoke more formal language production, in which participants would have more time to think, create, and construct with the language, which in turn would allow for a higher level of employment of the subjunctive mood in Spanish. Based on the statistical analysis of the data collected for the present study, the answer to question (5) is yes, difference in medium of expression (written versus spoken) did seem to affect subjunctive employment among participants. All groups scored higher in the written (WT) task, than in the oral task (OT). Within the OT, Colombian participants (monolinguals and HLSs) scored higher than the other two groups, and Colombian HLSs scored the highest in the WT among all groups. However, overall scores for all groups in the WT, when compared to the OT, are higher demonstrating a higher use of the subjunctive in the WT.

Table 4.16 below presents the study’s population sample’s totals for all groups and tasks are presented. Although in order to determine real differences between all four groups
and to verify that these differences were not coincidental\textsuperscript{56} the results from the statistical analysis were used; in this section the sample numbers are presented as a rough comparison within the sample group which means that these numbers do not necessarily extend to the whole population. Any comparisons presented next regarding medium of expression based on these sample numbers are only for this sample group, and were not used to draw any conclusion in the present study.

Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Percentages for All Groups and All Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL_HLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX_HLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL_MONO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX_MONO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question (6) Does HLSs’ usage parallel difference in usage of the subjunctive between Mexican and Colombian monolinguals? took into consideration monolinguals’ tendencies to simplify the Spanish mood system. Based on the literature, it was expected that Mexican monolinguals would tend to simplify the employment of the subjunctive mood in Spanish (Gutiérrez, 1994; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979). Based on the statistical analysis of the data collected for the present study, the answer to question (6) is yes for both production tasks; in both production tasks (OT and WT) Mexican monolinguals scored lower than their Colombian counterparts. In the recognition task (GJT); however, Mexican monolinguals scored higher than their Colombian counterparts. These results suggest that the documented oral and written tendency to simplify and avoid the subjunctive mood in Spanish is valid; however, it does not render

\textsuperscript{56} By “coincidental” I mean due to the particular individuals who participated in the study.
Mexican monolinguals unable to recognize the need for subjunctive in certain context; and their ability to correct incorrect statements when needed. In general, it seems that the difference in subjunctive use observed among monolinguals from Colombia and Mexico, is reflected among the Colombian and Mexican HLSs who participated in this study.
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Using cross-linguistic influence as the theoretical perspective informing this study predisposed me to look for cross-linguistic influence or transfer in HLSs’ employment of the Spanish subjunctive. It was anticipated that this influence would transpire in many different ways: at the conscious and unconscious levels (Meisel, 1983), in forward or backward motion from English to Spanish and vice versa – although only the English>Spanish influence would be considered (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Jarvis & Odlin, 2000), in successfully or unsuccessful ways (positive and negative transfer, Jarvis & Odlin, 2000; Kellerman, 1995, 1979), and in cases of avoidance, simplification, or omission when compared to their monolingual counterparts (Jarvis & Odlin, 2000). What I found in this study was clear evidence of a permeable Spanish verbal and mood system57 observed in the grammatical repertoire of some of the Spanish HLSs who participated in this study. However, it is worthy of note that this influence did not seem to be the major factor in these HLSs simplifying or avoiding the use of the subjunctive mood. Native speaker subjunctive use and task at hand seemed to bet the two variables that influenced subjunctive use among HLSs more than language contact with the English system or language attrition.

Effects of Ethnicity and Language Background

With regard to Mexican and Colombian HLSs, this study confirmed that both HLS groups showed signs of subjunctive reduction, simplification, avoidance, and omission in Spanish. However, it seemed that the Colombian HLS group’s simplification did not deter them from maintaining high levels of Spanish subjunctive use in production activities such as in the OT and WT. Mexican HLSs did not score as high in production tasks, showing fewer

57 As suggested by Silva-Corvalán (1986).
signs of subjunctive maintenance in the OT and the WT. In terms of finding errors and correcting them, Colombian HLSs seemed less capable than Mexican HLSs.

The difference between the two HLS groups could be due to the way monolinguals in Colombia and Mexico are presently using the subjunctive mood (i.e., this study showed a higher tendency among Mexican monolinguals to simplify subjunctive use when compared to Colombian monolinguals). Secondly, the HLS difference could be attributed to the socioeconomic status and the level of education of the HLSs’ families and communities in the U.S. where they learned Spanish. However, at this time, this cannot be attest because this type of demographic information was not gathered for the present study.

With regard to monolinguals, the present study confirmed the already documented Spanish subjunctive mood simplification among Mexican monolinguals, and contributes to the discussion by adding a new group that has not been widely written about in terms of subjunctive simplification, Colombian monolinguals who in the present study also showed instances of subjunctive simplification, avoidance, and omission.

**Conclusions (from Statistical Analyses) and Implications Regarding Tasks**

Both production tasks (OT and WT) proved to be extremely effective for gathering authentic and naturally produced data from HLSs and monolinguals alike. The GJT was not as useful, especially when gathering data on the ability to recognize subjunctive omission among Colombian HLSs. This group’s results support Oh and Au’s (2005) caveats about employing GJTs with HLSs. Colombian HLSs clearly demonstrated an consistent and strong ability to produce native-like language in the OT and the WT, but when it came to judging statements in which the subjunctive was misused and correcting them, their ability level decreased from having the best score in the WT and sharing the highest score in the OT with
the Colombian monolinguals, to receiving the lowest score in the GJTN. This indicates that the Colombian HLSs’ metalinguistic abilities were lower than their Mexican counterparts.

**Oral Task (OT)**

As mentioned before, the OT was chosen with the purpose of eliciting the most natural and spontaneous language production from the participants. In this task, the term Country of Origin was the only significant variable; the probability of a Mexican participant (whether monolingual or HLS) using the subjunctive mood in a single instance on the OT was lower (0.672) than that of a Colombian (whether monolinguals or HLSs) (0.774). Therefore, as hypothesized in the study, Colombians (whether monolinguals or HLSs) showed a greater tendency to use the subjunctive mood orally. The implication of this finding is that changes in monolingual language use seem to impact directly on HLSs’ language use.

**Written Task (WT)**

The WT was included in this study in order to gather language produced by participants in a semi-guided setting where they would be able to express themselves freely. However, since it was a written task, participants had more time to think and make decisions on how they were going to express themselves than on the oral task. Thus, they were expected to reflect more on language form. In this study, neither term Version of Language or Country of Origin presented significant differences in score. Language*Country interaction was the only term statistically significant on the WT, with Colombian HLSs scoring significantly higher on average than the Mexican HLSs. Monolingual scores were too close to each other to find a significant difference in language use.
Mexican HLSs’ scores suggest a tendency to simplify, avoid, or omit the employment of the Spanish subjunctive mood more often than their Colombian HLS counterparts. This could be a result of the language acquired from Mexican monolinguals, and not a consequence of an encroachment of their dominant language (English) over Spanish L1 (Marian & Kaushanskaya, 2007; Odlin, 1989).

**Grammaticality Judgment Task – Adjective Clauses (GJTA)**

The GJT was the most structured of the three tasks. It was also a mainly receptive task. For analysis this task was divided up into two groups: for adjective clauses (GJTA) and for noun clauses (GJTN). In the GJTA none of the terms: Version of Language, Country of Origin, or their combination Language*Country proved to be statistically significant. Backward elimination did not reveal any statistically significant terms, indicating that there was no statistically significant difference between any of the four groups on the GJTA. This could be a result of the small sample sizes in each group, combined the low number of questions per person (five). Based on Blake’s (1985) findings suggesting that by age seven monolingual Spanish children have full command of adjectival clauses (p. 167), it was expected that the English system would not negatively influence the HLSs’ mood choice in adjective clauses. It was reasoned that despite having English as their dominant language, these HLS participants grew up hearing and in many cases speaking Spanish at home and in their communities. Thus, it was predicted that the feel and intuition (Ahern & Leonetti, 2004) for mood choice in adjective and noun clauses would still be available to HLSs. This expectation was borne out by the results of this study.
Grammaticality Judgment Task – Noun Clauses (GJTN)

On the GJTN, two terms – Version of Language and Language*Country – proved to be significant. The findings for the GJTN showed that Mexican monolinguals had the highest probability of using the subjunctive correctly on the GJTN (significantly higher than all other groups); followed by the Mexican HLSs, the Colombian monolinguals and the Colombian HLSs who scored the lowest in the GJTN demonstrating a low ability to find subjunctive mood errors and correcting them.

Implications

Colombian HLSs’ years of education did not seem to impact, on average, the ability of the HLSs to provide the correct form of the subjunctive in incorrectly written statements (as in the GJTN). The results obtained through the analysis of the GJTN for Colombian HLSs seemed to support Oh and Au’s (2005) contention that HLSs have the ability to sound native-like when producing language but are less able to use the same knowledge in situations where they are expected to make a correction rather than using it spontaneously. This was the case of GJTN among Colombian HLSs.

Simplification seemed to be transpiring across groups regardless of whether they were monolinguals or HLSs; this finding supports Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) conclusion that “the seeds of change are to be found in the basically monolingual communities of origin” (pp. 267-8), instead of representing a sign of possible linguistic influence from English (Marian & Kaushanskaya, 2007; Odlin, 1989). Although one possible explanation for item (16) of the GJT was that the dominant language of the HLSs who accepted the incorrect form could have been influencing their judgment, it was not a common occurrence in the present study. Therefore, item (16) was more likely an exception than the norm.
Pedagogical Implications

In terms of pedagogical implications, the study suggests a need to raise awareness among Spanish language teachers with regards to HLSs. They need to understand that even though some HLSs might sound like Spanish native speakers, they cannot be expected they know the language the way a native speaker would. Most importantly, they may still need guidance in various linguistic aspects and mood system is one important part. Regardless of what variety the HLS speaks, teachers need to help HLSs acquire the standard language expected of them in formal settings while being respectful and careful not to negatively affect the HLSs’ believes and attitudes towards themselves and their heritage language. For example, although code-switching and informal language use are valid communicative strategies, they may not be acceptable or work well in more formal or academic settings, or when speaking with Spanish monolinguals. Additionally, assessment and feedback on language skills must be consciously planned so as not to make HLSs feel as if their language variety is sub-standard or stigmatized especially if the Spanish language teacher is a native speaker.

With regard to medium of expression, in oral communication certain forms such as orita ‘now’ are acceptable (in certain contexts). Yet, it is paramount to instruct and guide HLSs in the use of more formal language that might be more appropriate in other contexts. This would be the same as explaining to an English speaker that “BTW” is acceptable when texting but that the words must be spelled out when writing a paper.

Based on the fact that the Spanish language system might be undergoing internal change favoring the use of the indicative in some context and varieties (Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Gutiérrez, 1994; Rojas Anadón, 1979), it might be important to consider whether this
mood needs to be addressed and corrected in all instances, or if it would be beneficial to accept the indicative instead of the subjunctive in contexts where the native speakers are presenting a tendency to use the indicative; especially in beginner courses.

Valdés (1981, pp. 8-10) wrote that HLSs do not belong in foreign language classes hence it is extremely important that schools and universities offer Spanish courses exclusively developed for HLSs that do not aim to teach Spanish as a foreign language but that teaches it considering HLSs’ needs. In the case of HLSs the best way of teaching the language might in a contextualized manner with sporadic and individual grammatical explanations that may arise from specific students’ questions.

**Suggestions for future research**

Future research might take myriad forms. For example, it would be fruitful to compare L2/FL Spanish learners with HLSs in subjunctive use, or to add them as a third group as part of a tripartite comparison between monolinguals, HLSs, and L2/FL Spanish learners.

A replication of the present study using a larger number of participants might help us to better gauge the effects of national origin and heritage language status on subjunctive use.

Adding to the existing body of literature on studies regarding Spanish monolinguals’ subjunctive mood erosion, simplification, avoidance, or omission could be of utmost value when studying HLSs. Future studies might determine if language use among HLSs is a by-product of dominant language influence or if it due to the Spanish spoken at home or in the community (in the U.S.) and learned informally. Studies could also aid in deciding what to teach HLSs based on the monolingual native speaker use rather than an ideal version of language that might be falling in disuse among native speakers.
Another venue that could be of immense value would be the study of the effect of direct subjunctive mood instruction through Spanish language courses to HLSs; i.e., a focus-on-form approach for HLSs. These studies would help determine if direct instruction makes a difference in the way HLSs use the Spanish subjunctive mood.
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APPENDIX A – HLSs’ Consent Form – Original Version

I, _________________________________, agree to participate in a research study titled “COMPARING SUBJUNCTIVE USE BETWEEN MONOLINGUAL SPANISH NATIVE-SPEAKERS and BILINGUAL SPANISH HERITAGE LANGUAGE SPEAKERS” conducted by Lourdes (Lou) Tolosa from the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of Georgia (ugast1@uga.edu) under the direction of Dr. Linda Harklau, Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of Georgia (lharklau@uga.edu). I understand that my participation is voluntary. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at anytime without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I can ask to have all of the information about me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The reason for this study is to gather information on Spanish language use amongst bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers. If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:

1) Complete a demographic survey about myself which will take 25 minutes
2) Participate in an oral/transcription task in which I will record my answers to 10 pre-recorded prompts. Once I answer and record all questions, I will transcribe them onto a word document that I will save and send to Ms. Lourdes (Lou) Tolosa at ugast1@yahoo.com
3) Participate in a written task using SurveyMonkey.com in which I will answer eight written questions
4) Participate in a grammaticality judgment task that I will receive via SurveyMonkey.com in which I will read, judge and correct (if needed) 25 sentences.

There are no material incentives offered in the form of payment, gifts, or extra credit for my participation. I will not receive any financial benefit from this research. However, there are two main benefits to be gained by the bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers’ community: 1) the personal benefit of having the opportunity to reflect upon your own language use and preference; and 2) the academic benefit of advancing our knowledge with regard to language use and preference dealing with bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers. The researcher also hopes to learn more about possible linguistic and cultural influences that the two languages spoken and used by the bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers might have on each other.

No present or future risks are expected or foreseen in this study.

No individually-identifiable information about me, or provided by me during the research, will be shared with others without my written permission. I will be assigned an identifying number which will be used on all of the data provided by me to the researcher (consent forms, surveys, oral task, written task, and grammaticality judgment task). The audio-recorded and written data will be kept indefinitely, and will be employed as a source of language production which could potentially inspire additional research on bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers’ language use. My contact information, however, will be destroyed by May 2012.

The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project.

I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.

Lourdes (Lou) Tolosa
Name of Researcher
Telephone: 678-907-0090
Email: ugast1@uga.edu

Name of Participant
Participant’s Telephone Number: __________________________ (optional)
Participant’s Email Address: __________________________ (optional)

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu
Estimado Participante:

Mi nombre es Lourdes (Lou) Tolosa y soy una estudiante graduada en la Universidad de Georgia, en Athens, Georgia, Estados Unidos. Trabajo bajo la dirección de la Dra. Linda Harklau del Departamento de Language and Literacy Education en la Universidad de Georgia. El motivo de esta carta es para invitarte a participar en mi estudio titulado: “Comparing Subjunctive Use Between Monolingual Spanish Native-Speakers and Bilingual Spanish Heritage Language Speakers”; los “Bilingual Spanish Heritage Language Speakers” son personas que si bien viven o son de los Estados Unidos crecieron hablando español en casa y además, en algunos casos, tomaron algún curso de español.

El propósito de este estudio es recoger datos relacionados con el uso de la lengua entre estos participantes y compararlo con el uso que hacen del idioma los hablantes nativos del español (como tú).

Para poder participar en este estudio debes cumplir los siguientes requisitos: 1) tener por lo menos 18 años de edad; 2) ser hablante nativo monolingüe del español de Colombia o México; y 3) ser estudiante universitario o haberte graduado de la universidad (sin importar el título que hayas recibido).

Si acuerdas participar en este estudio, tu participación va a constar de una pequeña encuesta demográfica de siete preguntas y tres actividades: una oral con transcripción escrita (verbatim) de 10 preguntas y tus 10 respuestas; una escrita de ocho preguntas; y una en la cual leerás 25 frases y las corregirás si lo consideras necesario.

La encuesta demográfica es la primera actividad. Si respondes a esta invitación recibirás un enlace donde podrás completar las 7 preguntas de la encuesta. Una vez que yo reciba tu encuesta te mandaré instrucciones para que puedas hacer la actividad oral. Para hacer la actividad oral vas a recibir un nombre de usuario y una contraseña que te permitirá acceder al sistema de eLC en la Universidad de Georgia. Cuando termines de grabar tus respuestas orales y transcribas las preguntas y respuestas en un documento de Word, me las enviarás a ugast1@yahoo.com. Una vez que reciba tu actividad oral con la transcripción te mandaré los enlaces para las dos últimas actividades por correo electrónico. La segunda actividad será escrita; en ella vas a contestar ocho preguntas; y la tercera actividad consiste en una serie de 25 oraciones que tú vas a leer y si las consideras incorrectas vas a corregirlas usando el mismo programa. En total, tu participación en las cuatro actividades (encuesta demográfica, actividad oral, escrita, y las oraciones) no te llevará más de dos horas.

Tu participación en este estudio es completamente voluntaria, por lo cual no estás obligado(a) a participar en él. Inclusive, puedes dejar de participar en él sin que esto traiga consigo ningún tipo de problema para ti, castigo, o multa.

Por favor, considera que la comunicación vía la red es insegura lo cual limita el nivel de confidencialidad que se pueda garantizar por el uso de tecnología en sí misma. Sin embargo, una vez que reciba tus actividades terminadas, guardaré todos tus datos en un gabinete con llave al que yo sola tendré acceso. Toda la información que te pueda identificar será destruida en mayo de 2012. Si comienzas a participar en el estudio pero quieres dejar de hacerlo, por favor comunícate inmediatamente conmigo vía correo electrónico a: ugast1@uga.edu

Es posible que los resultados de este estudio sean publicados pero tu nombre no será usado, ni tus respuestas podrán ser identificadas ya que solamente se presentarán los resultados en forma de resumen. También, es posible que los resultados obtenidos en este estudio den información sobre la preferencia del uso del español entre los “bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers” al compararse sus usos con los de los nativo hablantes; y que les permita reflexionar su uso del español y sus preferencias lingüísticas.

Este estudio no representa ningún tipo de riesgo o molestia física o mental para los participantes.

Si tienes preguntas sobre el estudio, por favor escríbeme a ugast1@uga.edu; si por el contrario tienes preguntas o dudas sobre tus derechos como participante en este estudio, por favor comunícate directamente con: The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 612 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; teléfono (706) 542-3199; dirección de correo electrónico: irb@uga.edu.

Al completar y entregar la encuesta demográfica (usando surveymonkey.com) aceptas participar en el proyecto descrito en esta carta.

Gracias por tu participación. Por favor, guarda una copia de esta carta por cualquier eventualidad.

Atentamente,
Lourdes (Lou) Tolosa
Mono’s Information Letter – Translated Version

Dear participant:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Linda Harklau in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at The University of Georgia. The purpose of this letter is to invite you to participate in my research study entitled “Comparing Subjunctive Use Between Monolingual Spanish Native-Speakers and Bilingual Spanish Heritage Language Speakers.” “Bilingual Spanish Heritage Language Speakers” are individuals who even if they live in the U.S. they grew up speaking Spanish at home, and in some cases also took Spanish classes.

The purpose of this study is to gather data regarding language usage amongst bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers and compare it with native-Spanish speakers’ (such as you) language use.

In order to be eligible to participate in this study you must fit the following requirements: 1) be at least 18 years old; 2) be a monolingual Spanish speaker from Colombia or Mexico; and 3) be a college student or have graduated from college (regardless of degree).

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will consist of a seven question demographic survey, and three tasks: an oral/transcription task with a (verbatim) transcription of 10 pre-recorded questions and your 10 answers; a written task consisting of eight questions; and a third task requires that you read, judge and if necessary correct 25 sentences.

The demographic survey is the first task. If you reply to this letter you will receive a link where you will complete the seven survey questions. Once I receive your completed survey I will send you instructions so you can access the oral task. In order to complete the oral task you will receive a username and a password that will allow you to access the eLC system at the University of Georgia. Once you finish the oral task and the transcription (in a Word document) you will send the document to me via email at ugast1@yahoo.com. As I receive the completed first task, I will send you the links for the last two activities via email. Your second task will be a written task consisting of eight questions that you will answer in writing; the third task contains a 25-sentence-story that you will read one-by-one and correct (if necessary) using the same program. Overall, your participation in this study should not take longer than two hours.

Your involvement in the study is completely voluntary; therefore you have no obligation to participate in it. In fact, it is your right to stop participating in it at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Please note that Internet communications are not secure and that guaranteed confidentiality is limited; however, please know that once I receive your completed survey and tasks, I will store them in a locked cabinet in my office. Additionally, I will destroy any contact information or personal identification data that your provide by May 2012. If you begin your participation and at any time wish to withdraw, please let me know immediately at ugast1@uga.edu.

The results of the research study may be published but your name, your answers, or any other identifying data that you provide during your participation will be omitted. Published results will be presented solely in summary form. It is also possible that the findings from this project may provide information on bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers’ language preferences and language use when compared to monolingual Spanish speakers’ language use. Additionally, this study will encourage and allow individual participants the opportunity to reflect on their personal language use and language preference.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

If you have any questions about this research project, please e-mail me at ugast1@uga.edu; if on the other hand, you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant please contact: The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 612 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

By completing and returning the demographic survey you agree to participate in previously described research project.

Thank you for your consideration! Please keep a copy of this letter for your records.

Sincerely,

Lourdes (Lou) Tolosa
APPENDIX C – SurveyMonkey.com Consent Form/Demographic Survey

Original Version (www.surveymonkey.com):

Gracias por participar en mi estudio. Por favor, contesta las siete preguntas en esta página. Cuando las reciba te mandaré instrucciones sobre cómo completar las tres actividades para este estudio: una oral, una escrita, y una que consiste en leer y -si lo consideras necesario - corregir 25 oraciones. Otra vez, gracias por participar.

Si tienes preguntas sobre el estudio, por favor escribeme a: ugast1@yahoo.com

1. Nombre y Apellido:
2. Edad ¿Cuántos años tienes?
3. Quiero participar en este estudio. Al marcar “Sí” abajo aceptas participar en este estudio y permites que yo use tu información para mi estudio de doctorado. Options: “Sí” and “No”
4. Yo soy… - options: “mujer” and “hombre”
5. Yo soy… (elige la nacionalidad latinoamericana o el grupo que te representa más o con el que te identificas más). – options: colombiano(a) and mexicano(a)
6. Yo soy de… (escribe el nombre tu ciudad, pueblo, localidad)
7. ¿A qué te dedicas? Incluye tu trabajo/profesión o área(s) de estudio

Translated Version:

Thank you for participating in my study. Please answer the seven questions in this page. After I receive them completed, I will send you instructions on how to proceed with the three tasks for the present study: an oral, a written, and one that involves reading and –if necessary- correcting 25 sentences. Again, thank you for participating.

If you have questions about the study, please write to me at: ugast1@yahoo.com

1. First and Last Name:
2. Age – How old are you?
3. I wish to participate in this study. By selecting “Si” (yes) below you are agreeing to participate in this study and to allow me to use your information for my doctoral study. Options: “yes” and “no”
4. I am… Options: “female” and “male”
5. I am … (choose the Latin-American nationality that best represents you, or that identifies you the most) – Options: Different Latin American nationalities including Colombian and Mexican
6. I am from… (write the name of your city, town, locality)
7. What do you do for a living? Include your job/profession or area(s) of study
APPENDIX D – HLS Socio-demographic Survey – Original Version

Gracias por firmar el formulario de consentimiento accediendo a participar en mi estudio. El próximo paso es completar la encuesta presentada a continuación. Por favor completala y entregasela a Lou antes de irte. No te olvides de completar la PARTE E al final de la encuesta si estás interesado(a) en participar en mi estudio sobre hablantes bilingües de herencia. ¡Gracias por tu participación!

PARTE A – Por favor completa todas las preguntas lo mejor que puedas

1. ¿Dónde naciste?
2. Si naciste fuera de los Estados Unidos, ¿qué edad tenías cuando te mudaste a los Estados Unidos?
3. ¿Dónde nacieron tus padres?
   Madre:
   Padre:
4. ¿Dónde nacieron tus abuelos?
   Abuela materna:
   Abuelo materno:
   Abuela paterna:
   Abuelo paterno:

PARTE B – Por favor marca todas las actividades que puedes hacer en español.

1. En español, yo puedo leer…
   ____ Periódicos
   ____ Literatura (ficción)
   ____ Libros académicos
   ____ Revistas
   ____ Boletines de noticias
   ____ Poesía
   ____ Otro, por ejemplo:
   ____ Yo no leo en español

2. En español, yo puedo escribir…
   ____ Cartas
   ____ Ensayos
   ____ Apuntes de clase
   ____ Otro, por ejemplo:
   ____ Yo no escribo en español

3. Yo puedo entender…
   ____ a todos los hispanohablantes que conozco
   ____ los miembros de mi familia que hablan español
   ____ hispanohablantes en la televisión
   ____ mis amigos que hablan español
   ____ chistes en español
   ____ tradiciones hispanoamericanas
   ____ creencias hispanoamericanas
   ____ suposiciones/ideas hispanoamericanas
   ____ Otro, por ejemplo:
   ____ Yo no entiendo español

4. En español, yo puedo hablar…
   ____ sobre la vida diaria
   ____ sobre temas relacionados con la escuela
   ____ y ser entendido(a) por cualquier hispanohablante
   ____ Otro, por ejemplo:
   ____ Yo no hablo español
PARTE C – Por favor elige el idioma en el cual te sientes más cómodo(a) expresando lo siguiente...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.°</th>
<th>ESPAÑOL</th>
<th>INGLÉS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>rehusar una invitación de manera cordial</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>hacer una invitación</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>hacer un pedido</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>pedir disculpas</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>dar una órden</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>hacer una promesa</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>expresar alegría</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>expresar tristeza</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>expresar ira/rabia</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>discrepar con alguien</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>poner en duda el comportamiento de alguien</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>expresar preocupaciones</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>expresar intereses</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>expresar deseos y sueños</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>expresar agradecimiento</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>quejarte</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>halagar a alguien</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>aceptar halagos</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>hablar sobre sentirte estresado(a) o abrumado</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTE D – Por favor contesta las preguntas de la manera más detallada posible:

1. ¿Cuál es(sen) tu(s) lengua(s) maternal(es)? ¿Por qué?
2. ¿Te sientes más cómodo(a) con uno de los idiomas que hablas? ¿Cuál? ¿Por qué?
3. ¿Alguna vez asististe a la escuela en un país hispanoamericano? ¿Por cuánto tiempo?
4. ¿Has tomado clases de español en los Estados Unidos? Por favor dime: cuántas clases tomaste, de qué se trataban y de qué nivel eran.
5. ¿Cómo te defines a nivel lingüístico? ¿Ha cambiado? ¿Cómo? ¿Por qué?
6. ¿Cómo te defines a nivel cultural? ¿Ha cambiado? ¿Cómo? ¿Por qué?
7. ¿Cómo te defines a nivel étnico? ¿Ha cambiado? ¿Cómo? ¿Por qué?

¿Estás tomando clases de español ahora? Si lo estás haciendo, por favor completa la información abajo (nivel y nombre del curso)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivel</th>
<th>Nombre del Curso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Por último, ¿hablas, lees, escrebes, comprendes, o puedes expresar sentimientos en otra(s) lengua(s)? ¿Cuál(es)?
PARTE E

ATENCIÓN: Por tratarse de un asunto confidencial, la PARTE E va a ser SEPARADA de tu encuesta socio-demográfica.

Por favor marca aquí si quieres y te es posible participar en este estudio como fue explicado por la investigadora.

Debajo, por favor incluye tu nombre y apellido (obligatorio); una dirección de correo electrónico que cheques regularmente, y tu número telefónico (opcionales). ¡Gracias!

Nombre y apellido del participante:
Correo electrónico del participante (opcional):
Número telefónico del participante (opcional):
HLS Socio-demographic Survey – Translated Version

Thank you for signing the consent form agreeing to participate in this study. The next step is to complete the survey below. Please fill it out and turn it into Lou before leaving. Do not forget to fill out PART E at the bottom of the survey if you are interested in participating in this dissertation study about bilingual Spanish heritage language speakers. Thank you for your participation!

PART A – Please answer all questions to the best of your ability

1. Where were you born?

2. If you were born in a country other than the U.S. how old were you when you moved to the U.S.?

3. Where were your parents born?
   Mother:
   Father:

4. Where were your grandparents born?
   Maternal grandmother:
   Maternal grandfather:
   Paternal grandmother:
   Paternal grandfather:

PART B – Please check all the activities that you are able to do in Spanish.

1. In Spanish I am able to read...
   ____ Newspapers
   ____ Literature (fiction)
   ____ Academic books
   ____ Magazines
   ____ Newsletters
   ____ Poetry
   ____ Other, for example:
   ____ I do not read in Spanish

2. In Spanish I am able to write...
   ____ Letters
   ____ Academic writing
   ____ Class notes
   ____ Other, for example:
   ____ I do not write in Spanish

3. I am able to understand...
   ____ every Spanish-speaker I meet
   ____ my Spanish-speaking family members
   ____ Spanish-speakers on TV
   ____ my Spanish-speaking close friends
   ____ jokes in Spanish
   ____ Spanish traditions
   ____ Spanish beliefs
   ____ Spanish cultural assumptions
   ____ Other, for example
   ____ I do not understand Spanish

4. In Spanish I am able to speak/talk...
   ____ about everyday life
   ____ about school-related topics in class
   ____ with all Spanish-speakers and be clearly understood by them
   ____ Other, for example:
   ____ I do not speak Spanish
PART C – Please select the language in which you feel more comfortable expressing the following…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>politely declining an invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>making an invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>making a request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>apologizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>giving an order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>making a promise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>expressing happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>expressing sadness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>expressing anger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>disagreeing with somebody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>questioning someone's actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>expressing concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>expressing interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>expressing hopes and dreams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>expressing gratitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>complaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>complimenting somebody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>accepting compliments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>talking about feeling stressed or overwhelmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART D – Please answer the following questions as thoroughly as possible:

1. Which language(s) do you consider your first language? Why?
2. Do you feel more “at home” with one of the languages you speak? Which one? and Why?
3. Did you ever go to school in a Spanish-speaking country? If YES, for how long?
4. Have you ever taken Spanish classes in the U.S.? If YES, please tell me about the classes you have taken, how many of them, and what levels were they.
5. How do you define yourself linguistically? Has this changed? How? Why?

Are you presently taking Spanish courses? If you are, please indicate levels and course name(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, do you speak, read, write, understand or are able to express feelings in any other language(s)? If yes, which one(s)?
PART E

ATTENTION: For confidentiality purposes, PART E will be DETACHED from your socio-demographic survey.

Please check here if you are willing and able to participate in the present study as explained by the researcher. Below, please include your first and last names (mandatory), and an email address that you check regularly and your phone number below (optional). Thank you!

Participant’s first and last names:
Participant’s email address (optional):
Participant’s phone number (optional):
APPENDIX E – Script for the Oral Task (OT)

Below are the 10 questions asked to participants during the OT. Participants never saw/read the questions that appear below. They only heard them (repeated twice) during the OT. As a reminder, in order to complete the OT participants were to listen and answer question and answer and to transcribe both into a Microsoft Word document.

**Original Version**

Q1: ¿Qué características buscas con respecto a la personalidad del niñero o de la niñera?
Q2: ¿Se necesita alguna preparación profesional para conseguir este trabajo?
Q3: Con relación al cuidado de tus niños, ¿qué quieres del niñero o de la niñera?
Q4: Con respecto a la limpieza de tu casa, ¿qué esperas del niñero o de la niñera?
Q5: Describe por lo menos 3 características esenciales o indispensables que esta persona debe tener para poder trabajar con tus hijos.
Q6: Comparte por lo menos 3 consejos que el niñero o la niñera va a recibir de nuestra agencia antes de comenzar a trabajar con tus hijos.
Q7: Si surge una emergencia, ¿qué debe hacer el niñero o la niñera?
Q8: Si el niñero o la niñera tiene problemas graves con tus hijos, ¿qué le sugieres?
Q9: Graba un mensaje dirigido a tus hijos, ellos lo van a escuchar con el niñero o la niñera en tu casa en su primer día de trabajo con tus hijos.
Q10: ¿Hay alguna otra información que quieres compartir con la persona que va a cuidar a tus hijos?

**Translated Version**

Q1: What personal traits do you look for in a baby-sitter?
Q2: Do potential candidates need a special kind of professional preparation in order to be hired for this job?
Q3: With regard to the care of your children, what do you want from the babysitter?
Q4: With regard to cleaning the house, what do you expect from the babysitter?
Q5: Describe a minimum of 3 essential or indispensable characteristics that the babysitter must have in order to work with your children.
Q6: Share a minimum of three pieces of advice that our agency will relay to the babysitter before s/he begins to work with your children.
Q7: If there is an emergency, what should the babysitter do?
Q8: If the babysitter has serious problems with your child, what do you suggest s/he do?
Q9: Please record a message for your children. They will listen to it with the babysitter on his/her first day with them.
Q10: Is there additional information that you would like to share with the person who will take care of your children?
APPENDIX F – Questions Included in the Written Task (WT)

**Original Version**

The first two questions were asked of the participants solely for identification and classification purposes within the surveymonkey program. Questions 3-10 were the eight questions used to collect the WT data for the study.

1. Escribe tu nombre y apellido aquí
2. Yo soy... (elige la nacionalidad latinoamericana o el grupo que te representa más o con el que te identificas más).

3. ¿Cuántos hijos tienes?
4. ¿Cuántos años tiene(n) tus hijos?
5. ¿Qué tipos de actividades le(s) gusta hacer?
6. ¿Qué tipo de persona buscas?
7. Con relación a la limpieza de tu casa, ¿Qué quieres de esta persona?
8. Con respecto al cuidado de tus niños, ¿Qué necesitas de esta persona?
9. En oraciones completas, describe por lo menos CINCO características esenciales, indispensables, necesarias o sumamente importantes para obtener este trabajo.
10. En oraciones completas, comparte CINCO (como mínimo) consejos, ideas o sugerencias que consideras importantes para el cuidado de tus hijo(s)/a(s).

**Translated Version**

1. Write your first and last name here
2. I am ... (choose the Latin-American nationality that best represents you, or that identifies you the most) – **Options: Different Latin American nationalities including Colombian and Mexican**

3. How many children do you have?
4. How old are your children?
5. What kinds of activities do they like?
6. What kind of person are you looking for? (please remember that the instructions explained the situation – see instructions in the body of the dissertation under WT)
7. With regard to house-keeping; what do you expect (want) from this person?
8. With regard to child-care; what do you need from this person?
9. In complete sentences, describe at least FIVE characteristics that you consider essential, indispensable, needed, or extremely important to get the job.
10. In complete sentences, at least share FIVE pieces of advice, ideas, and suggestions crucial for your child/ren’s care.
APPENDIX G – GJT 25-Sentence Story

Original Version

The first two questions were asked of the participants solely for identification and classification purposes within the surveymonkey program. Questions 3-27 were the 25 statements used to collect the GJT data for the study.

1. Escribe tu nombre y apellido aquí
2. Yo soy... (elige la nacionalidad latinoamericana o el grupo que te representa más o con el que te identificas más).
3. La señora López es una persona formidable pero tiene problemas con sus seis hijos.
4. Todos los días lleva a sus hijos a la escuela y después va a trabajar.
5. Aunque no lo necesita ahora, ella está buscando un coche nuevo que sea económico.
6. En la escuela sus hijos se portan mal y no escuchan a ningún adulto.
7. El menor quiere que su madre se mude sola.
8. La hija mayor quiere que su madre desaparezca y que los deja en paz para siempre.
9. La pobre Sra. López está preocupada, por eso ella busca una persona que aconseja a sus hijos.
10. Ella busca un/a psicólogo/a que pueda hablar con sus hijos.
11. Es indispensable que esta persona tiene un título universitario.
12. Los hijos de la Sra. López necesitan una persona que sea comprensiva pero también muy estricta.
13. También es esencial que esta persona sabe tratar con adolescentes.
14. Los profesores quieren que los hijos de la Sra. López crezcan y maduren pronto.
15. Los chicos desean dormir en clase, hablar mucho y no prestar atención.
16. La señora López quiere que sus hijos no duerman en clase.
17. Ella le aconseja a su hijo menor que coopere más, pero él no lo hace.
18. Ella sugiere que sus hijos consiguen un trabajo, pero ellos tampoco lo hacen.
19. En la casa es necesario que sus hijos sacan la basura una vez por semana, pero ellos se niegan a hacerlo.
20. Los niños de la Sra. López son tan vagos que nunca limpian nada ni ayudan a nadie.
21. La Sra. López quiere que hay paz en su casa. Está harta de los problemas con sus hijos.
22. Este verano ella desea que sus hijos van al campamento de verano para poder descansar...
23. ...y para poder descansar es indispensable que el campamento dura por lo menos dos semanas.
24. También es importante que el programa no permita que los chicos vuelven temprano.
25. Ella necesita unas vacaciones que la hagan sentir bien y que la relajen.
26. Sus hijos quieren que ella saca vacaciones eternas, y que no vuelve a casa jamás.
27. ¡Ellos necesitan que alguien les da una lección!

Translated Version

1. Write your first and last name here
2. I am ... (choose the Latin-American nationality that best represents you, or that identifies you the most) – Options: Different Latin American nationalities including Colombian and Mexican

3. Mrs. López is a great person but has trouble with her six children.
4. Every day she takes her children to school and then goes to work.
5. Although she does not need it right now, she is looking for a new and economic car.
6. At school her children misbehave and do not listen to any adult.
7. Her youngest son wants his mother to move out alone.
8. Her oldest daughter wants her mother to go away and to leave them alone forever.
9. Poor Mrs. López is worried, that is why she looks for a person who can advice her children.
10. She is looking for a psychologist who might be able to speak with her children.
11. It is absolutely necessary that this person have a college degree.
12. Mrs. López’s children need someone who is understanding but also very strict.
13. It is paramount that this person know how to work with adolescents.
14. Teachers want Mrs. López’s children grow up and mature soon.
15. Her children want to sleep in class, talk a lot, and not pay attention.
16. Mrs. López does not want her children to sleep in class.
17. She asks that her younger soon help more, but he does not do it.
18. She suggests that her children get a job, but they do not do that either.
19. At home it is necessary that her children take out the trash once a week, but they refuse to do it.
20. Mrs. López’s children are so lazy that they never clean anything nor they help anybody.
21. Mrs. López wants peace at home. She is fed up with her children’s problems.
22. This summer she wants her children to go to a summer camp so she can rest…
23. ... but to be able to rest it is paramount that the summer camp last at least two weeks.
24. It is also important that the program does not allow her children to return early.
25. She needs a break that makes her feel well and that relaxes her.
26. Her children want her to take eternal vacations, and that she does not return ever again.
27. They need to be taught a lesson!
APPENDIX H – Instructions for the Online Consent Form/Demographic Survey

Original Version

Gracias participar en mi estudio. Por favor, completa las preguntas en esta página y mándalas de vuelta a la investigadora. Una vez que termines con este documento, recibirás instrucciones en cómo completar las 3 actividades para este estudio: una oral, una escrita, y una que consiste en leer y -si lo consideras necesario - corregir veinticinco oraciones. Gracias por participar.

Si tienes preguntas sobre el estudio, por favor escribeme a: ugast1@yahoo.com

Translated Version

Thank you for participating in my study. Please complete the questions in this page and send them to the researcher. Once you finish with this document, you will receive instructions on how to complete the 3 activities needed for this study: one oral, one written, and one that involves reading and –if necessary- correcting twenty-five sentences.
Thank you for participating.

If you have questions about the study, please write to me at: ugast1@yahoo.com
APPENDIX I – Instructions Received by Participants after Completing the Online Consent Form/Demographic Survey

Original Version

Ahora puedes hacer las 3 actividades:

Actividad#1 – consiste en 3 pasos: 1) escuchar 10 preguntas orales (una a la vez); 2) grabar tus respuestas (una a la vez); 3) escuchar cada pregunta/respuesta y transcribirlas verbatim en un documento de Microsoft Word;

Actividad #2 – consiste en contestar 8 preguntas por escrito; y

Actividad #3 – consiste en leer y -si es necesario- corregir veinticinco oraciones (que forman un cuento).

POR FAVOR, NO trates de re-grabar o modificar ninguna de tus respuestas.

GRACIAS

Translated Version

Now you can do the 3 tasks:

Task #1 – consists of 3 steps: 1) listen to 10 oral questions (one at a time); 2) record your answers (one at a time); 3) listen to each question/answer and transcribe them verbatim in a Microsoft Word document;

Task #2 – consists of answering 8 written questions in writing; and

Task #3 – consists of reading and –if necessary- correcting twenty-five sentences (forming a story).

PLEASE, DO NOT try to re-record or modify any of your answers.

THANK YOU
Bienvenidos a la PRIMERA ACTIVIDAD

Gracias por participar en este estudio. La primera actividad consiste en escuchar, contestar y transcribir DIEZ preguntas orales y sus respuestas. Por favor escúchalas con atención y contéstalas en la manera más completa posible. Tienes un máximo de 5 minutos para contestar CADA pregunta. Al terminar de grabar las respuestas orales, escucha las preguntas y tus respuestas y en un documento de Microsoft Office Word 2003 escribe la pregunta que escuchaste y tu respuesta verbatim. El nombre de tu documento debe incluir: TU NOMBRE y TU NUMERO DE PARTICIPANTE. Después, adjunta y manda el documento escrito a: u gast1@yahoo.com. En el “asunto” del mensaje, por favor incluye tu nombre y número de participante.

Una vez que yo reciba tu primera actividad completa, te mandaré (via correo electrónico) enlaces para completar las otras dos actividades. ¡Gracias otra vez!

INSTRUCCIONES:

Imaginate que eres un padre o una madre y que necesitas una persona para cuidar a tus hijos por un fin de semana. Vas a la agencia de empleo y compartes tus necesidades con la persona encargada.

Usando la computadora, escucha las DIEZ preguntas y graba tu respuesta de manera oral. Habla directamente al micrófono de la computadora o de los auriculares. Vas a grabar DIEZ respuestas separadas.

Después de contestar cada pregunta, re-escucha la preguntas y la respuesta y transcribe ambas. Haz esto para las 10 preguntas y respuestas. Con la última transcripción (de la pregunta/respuesta número 10) terminas la primera actividad.

No re-grabes ninguna respuesta. La primera es suficiente. ¡Gracias!

** Puedes tomar unos minutos para pensar en la situación antes de empezar.

Welcome to the FIRST TASK,

Thank you for participating in this study. The first task consists of listening, answering, and transcribing TEN oral questions/answers. Please listen to each question carefully and answer them as completely as possible. You have a maximum of 5 minutes to answer EACH question. Once you finish recording your answers for each oral questions, please listen to the questions and your answers and using Microsoft Office Word 2003 word document type both of them verbatim. Your document’s name will include: YOUR NAME and YOUR PARTICIPANT NUMBER. Afterwards, please attach and send the written document to: u gast1@yahoo.com. In the subject of the message, please include your name and participant number.

Once I receive your completed first task, I will send you (via email) links to access and complete the 2 remaining tasks.
Thank you again!

INSTRUCTIONS:

Imagine that you are a parent and that you need a nanny to take care of your children for a weekend. You go to an employment agency and you share your needs with the clerk.

Using a computer, listen to TEN questions and record your answers orally. Please speak directly into the microphone. You will record TEN separate oral answers.

As you finish recording each answer, please listen to the question and your recorded reply, and transcribe both. Once the last transcription is completed (for question/answer number 10), you will have finished the first task.

Please, do not re-record any of your answers; with the first one is enough. Thank you!

** You can take a few minutes to think about the situation before beginning.
APPENDIX K – Instructions Received by Participants for the Written Task (WT)

Original Version

¡Hola! En esta actividad vas a contestar OCHO preguntas sobre la siguiente situación imaginaria:

Imagínate que tienes hijos(as) y que necesitas a una persona para cuidarlos por un fin de semana. Vas a una agencia de empleo y compartes tus necesidades con la persona encargada.

Por favor contesta las preguntas presentadas a continuación en oraciones COMPLETAS.

Gracias.

Translated Version

Hello! This task consists of EIGHT questions about the following imaginary situation:

Imagine that you have a child/children and that you need a nanny for the weekend. You go to an employment agency and share your needs with the clerk.

Please answer the questions as COMPLETELY as possible.

Thank you.
APPENDIX L – Instructions Received by Participants to Complete the Grammaticality Judgment Task (GJT)

Original Version

En esta actividad tu tarea es leer 25 oraciones y decidir si son correctas o incorrectas (una a la vez). Si piensas que la frase que lees es incorrecta, vas a seleccionar la opción “incorrecto,” y vas a re-escribir la oración con las correcciones necesarias en el espacio que aparece debajo de cada oración titulado: “Corrección.”

Si por el contrario piensas que la frase es correcta, entonces vas a seleccionar la opción “correcto,” no vas a modificar nada, y vas a pasar a la siguiente oración. ¡Gracias!

Translated Version

In this task you will read 25 sentences and decide if they are correct or incorrect (one at a time). If you think that the phrase is incorrect, you will select the “incorrect” button and you will re-write the sentence with the modification(s) you deem necessary in the space provided labeled “Corrección.”

If you think the phrase is correct, you will check the “correct” button, you will not modify anything, and you will continue on to the next statement.

Thank you!
APPENDIX M – Information Posted on the Last Screen of the GJT

Original Version

¡Terminaste! Gracias por tu participación en este estudio. Tu ayuda es invaluable.

Si tienes preguntas o te interesa saber los resultados de mi estudio, por favor escríbeme a ugast1@yahoo.com

Translated Version

You have finished! Thank you for your participation in the study. Your help is invaluable.

If you have any questions or are interested in knowing more about the study’s results, please write to me at: ugast1@yahoo.com
APPENDIX N – HLSs’ Information on Age and Gender

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Age: 23

Total by gender: 11 female, 7 male

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Age: 23

Total by gender: 16 female, 2 male
APPENDIX O – Monolinguals’ Information on Age and Gender

Table 3

**Gender and Age of COL MONOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Age 26

Total by gender 6 female 4 male

Table 4

**Gender and Age of MEX MONOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Age 35

Total by gender 5 female 5 male
APPENDIX P – Colombian HLSs’ Information on Place of Birth, Years in the U.S. (if Foreign Born), and Spanish Courses Taken (in years)

Table 5

**Colombian HLSs’ Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Years in the U.S. (if foreign born)</th>
<th>Spanish Courses (in years)</th>
<th>Taken in a Spanish-speaking country</th>
<th>Taken in the U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Pre-K-2nd grade) &amp; 1 (4th grade)</td>
<td>1 (ES) &amp; 1 (MS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4 (Pre-K-2nd grade) &amp; 1 (4th grade)</td>
<td>1 (ES) &amp; 1 (MS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 (pre-K, K) &amp; 6 (ES)</td>
<td>1 (College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Pre-K)</td>
<td>1 (MS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (pre-K, K)</td>
<td>4 (HS) &amp; 1 (College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (HS) &amp; 1 (College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5 (ES)</td>
<td>3 (HS) &amp; .5 (College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 (Pre-K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (College)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6 (ES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 (ES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (HS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 (pre-K, K) &amp; 2 (ES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (ES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 (pre-K, K) &amp; 1 (ES)</td>
<td>1 (HS) &amp; 2 (College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 (ES)</td>
<td>1 (HS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (pre-K, K) &amp; 4 (ES)</td>
<td>3 (HS) &amp; .5 (Grad School)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined years of Spanish formal education among COL. HLSs: 45.5 / 34
APPENDIX Q – Mexican HLSs’ Information on Place of Birth, Years in the U.S. (if Foreign Born), and Spanish Courses Taken (in years)

Table 6

**Mexican HLSs’ Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Years in the U.S. (if foreign born)</th>
<th>Spanish Courses (in years)</th>
<th>Taken in the U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 HS/Spanish major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (ES)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 (ES)</td>
<td>2 College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 (ES)</td>
<td>.5 MS; 4 HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 HS/ 1.5 College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 (K) &amp; 2 (ES)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4 (ES)</td>
<td>Spanish minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (ES)</td>
<td>1 MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (ES)</td>
<td>2 HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.5 (ES)</td>
<td>1 ES; 1 MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 (ES)</td>
<td>.5 online College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (pre-K, K) &amp; 1 (ES)</td>
<td>.5 College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 MS; .5 College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5 College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined years of Spanish formal education among MEX_HLSs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>