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Abstract
Prescriptive grammars of Spanish claim that inflectional markers of the subjunctive are required for subordinate clause verbs provided that: (1) this clause is introduced by the complementizer que ‘that’ and (2) the matrix clause construction corresponds to one of several semantic notions, such as the expression of finality, personal commentary, volition, or uncertainty. Actual speech data, however, reveal that speakers variably use indicative and subjunctive mood forms in these contexts. In an attempt to account for variation in the use of mood, many theorists have claimed that use of the subjunctive is also determined by pragmatic factors related to a speaker’s knowledge of and/or commitment to the speech proposition. Unfortunately, since these factors are difficult to measure quantitatively, claims of this nature tend to be highly speculative. Given the limitations of previous analyses, the current research will focus on the role of social factors (such as age, sex, language preference, and educational experience) in the conditioning of mood variation in the Spanish of Barelas, one of the original neighborhoods of Albuquerque. Due to the bilingual nature of the speech community, the grammatical distinction between indicative and subjunctive forms is slowly being lost, especially among English-dominant speakers who have never had any formal instruction in Spanish. The influence of English, which has all but lost morphological markers of mood in casual speech, may be serving to accelerate the loss of mood distinctions that is already taking place in monolingual varieties of Spanish.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Prescriptive accounts of the use of the subjunctive

As in other Romance languages, the subjunctive mood in Spanish is overtly marked by inflectional morphemes for verbs of subordinate clauses that are typically introduced in Spanish by the complementizer *que* ‘that’. Grammarian Andrés Bello (1902) claimed that this complementizer ‘triggers’ the use of the subjunctive when the matrix (main) clause verb corresponds to one of several semantic notions that require the use of the subjunctive, such as the expression of finality, volition, personal comment, future intention, and uncertainty. More recent prescriptive grammars (such as those of Butt and Benjamin, 2004; Kattan-Ibarra and Pountain, 1997; and Lunn and DeCesaris, 1992) account for the use of the subjunctive in a similar way. Though these accounts do not claim that the subjunctive is obligatory in each of these contexts, they do claim that it is obligatory in many of them. For example, Butt and Benjamin (2004:238–239) claim that use of the subjunctive is obligatory after matrix clauses expressing possibility/probability, wanting, needing, requesting, allowing, forbidding, and purpose. Kattan-Ibarra and Pountain (1997) and Lunn and DeCesaris (1992) give similar mandates with regards to matrix clauses expressing hope, possibility, and purpose. According to this general view, the subjunctive form has no real meaning and serves a primarily structural function of co-occurrence with the matrix clause, which lexically determines whether or not the subjunctive will be used. While the use of the subjunctive may be frequent for the verbs of subordinate clauses of many matrix constructions in Spanish that follow certain semantic classes such as those just described, it is by no means categorical. The prescriptive claim that certain semantic classes require the obligatory use of the subjunctive simply does not explain its actual usage in Spanish and fails to explain variation in the use of the subjunctive and indicative moods in subordinate clauses. The following examples, taken from interviews of Spanish-English bilinguals residing in the Albuquerque, New Mexico neighborhood of Barelas, clearly show mood variation after matrix clauses that prescriptively require the subjunctive.

Finality:

(1)

(a) *Bueno. Yo quisiera contarte de algo de mis abuelos para que me entienda (S) mejor.* ‘Well. I’d like to tell you something about my grandparents so that you’ll understand me better.’ (20/A:155)

(b) *También, así como crece, ayuda a uno. Es cómo se identifica con la familia también, a darle agua para que sigue (I) floreciendo, ¿no?* ‘Also, while it grows, it helps you. It’s how it identifies with the family also, by giving it water so it will keep blooming, right?’ (16/B:056)
Volition:
(2)
(a) ... me dijo, ‘Olvídate’. ‘Se te acabó todo’, dijo, ‘y espero que lo entiendes (S)’. ‘…he told me, “Forget about it”. “Everything’s over”, he said, “and I hope that you understand”.’ (17/A:178)
(b) Pues, yo quiero que mis niños aprenden (I) de lo que yo estoy haciendo, no otra gente. ‘Well, I want my kids to learn from what I’m doing, not from other people’. (07/A:324)

Comment:
(3)
(a) …nunca me ha gustado a mí que, que una persona que no me conozca le diga (S) a María algo así. ‘I’ve never liked that, that someone who doesn’t know me tells María something like that’. (20/A:246)
(b) No me importa que esté (I) a noventa grados. ‘I don’t care if it’s ninety degrees’. (10/B:035)

Future intention:
(4)
(a) No te vayas a mover hasta que venga (S) la maestra. ‘You’re not going to move until the teacher comes’. (21/A:267)
(b) Pero yo quiero verlos antes de que pasan (I) las cosas más feas. ‘But I want to see them before the worst things happen’. (22/A:214)

Uncertainty:
(5)
(a) …porque yo no, yo no conocía en realidad, ah, ah, que pudiera (S) el hombre tener una experiencia personal con Dios. ‘…because I didn’t, I didn’t really know, uh, uh, that man could have a personal experience with God’. (18/A:064)
(b) No creo que hicieron (I), pero también hacen fiestas cuando ponen, ponen los ‘booths’ afuera. ‘I don’t believe that they did, but they also have parties when they put, they put booths outside’. (16/B:117)

As these examples demonstrate, the use of indicative and subjunctive moods in contexts that prescriptively require the use of the subjunctive is variable in the Spanish of Barelas. This is the case even for Spanish-dominant speakers, of which there are seven in the current study (see appendix). As such, variation in the use of mood cannot be neatly attributed to imperfect second language learning or
partial acquisition. In fact, this variability is found in many monolingual dialects of Spanish and is not limited only to bilingual dialects. As Ocampo (1990) and Silva-Corvalán (1994) point out, however, the influence of English in contact varieties may be accelerating a decline in the use of the subjunctive, which is occurring at a slower rate in monolingual varieties. Since prescriptive accounts do not adequately describe variation in the linguistic manifestations of mood in Spanish, newer approaches have been established in order to explain the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses (1) as determined by pragmatic factors (such as the speaker’s knowledge of or experience with the discourse topic) in conjunction with the semantic nature of the matrix clause verb and (2) as being inherently variable, and therefore governed by certain structural factors.

1.2 A semantically based approach to the explanation of mood choice
The first semantically based theory was proposed by Lenz (1944) and further discussed in Bull (1960), Gili y Gaya (1969), Hadlich (1971), Rivero (1971), Terrell and Hooper (1974), Garcia and Terrell (1977), Bergen (1978), Lantolf (1978), Bell (1980), Blake (1985), King (1992), DeMello (1995), Studerus (1995), and Bosque and Demonte (1999). According to these analyses, the choice of mood within a given variable context is determined primarily by semantic and pragmatic factors relative to the discourse context. While there has been much debate concerning which factors most strongly favor the choice of mood in Spanish, the following have all been at least considered in the works just mentioned. According to Sastre Ruano (1997:60), these factors are:

1. the semantic context of V1 (matrix clause verb). Its character and meaning will determine the mood of V2 (subordinate clause verb);
2. the affirmative or negative character of the main (matrix) clause;
3. the group to which V1 belongs, which greatly determines the use of different mood forms;
4. the knowledge or lack of knowledge that the speaker has concerning the facts being discussed (translation mine).

Analyses in which these pragmatic and semantic factors are taken into account differ from prescriptive accounts of mood use in that the matrix verb alone does not lexically determine the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses, but rather conditions it in conjunction with pragmatic factors such as the speaker’s previous knowledge or experience of what is being described. This is most relevant in the more highly variable contexts, such as those in which the matrix clause expresses uncertainty. For example, in (5b) above, the speaker opts for the use of the indicative due to the fact that she already has prior knowledge of the situation being described and, though she cannot say for certain whether some
people did something, she still chooses to commit herself to the basic truth of the overall proposition. In this sense, the use of the indicative pragmatically conveys more of an affirmation than doubt, while the use of the subjunctive in (5a) would be seen as conveying absolute doubt as to the truth of the entire proposition. Within this framework, the subjunctive form is semantically significant and not determined lexically by the matrix verb. The matrix verb surely expresses doubt on the part of the speaker, but the choice of mood signals a semantic nuance that is pragmatically determined by the speaker with regards to his or her previous knowledge of what is being described and to what extent he or she is willing to commit to the truth of the proposition.

The problem with this type of semantic-pragmatic analysis is that assumptions are made about speakers’ thought processes and intentions, which are difficult to measure quantitatively and are highly speculative. In fact, very few studies of this type include the analysis of actual discourse data. The vast majority of studies, with the exceptions of Blake (1985) and DeMello (1995), use overtly solicited examples of language (via questionnaires) that do not reflect the actual variation that exists between the indicative and subjunctive in subordinate clauses that prescriptively require the subjunctive. Even the studies of Garcia and Terrell (1977) and Lantolf (1978), who claim to use real data from Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans, respectively, rely on the use of grammaticality judgments and questionnaires that do not reflect the actual usage of the subjunctive as it occurs in informal speech. This same approach was used most recently in Montrul (2007) and Gudmestad (2010), who elicited a large number of tokens of indicative and subjunctive forms via questionnaires and tasks that clearly reveal the object of study (i.e. it would be obvious even to the non-linguist that mood forms were being elicited from participants). These methods cannot be seen as viable for several reasons. First, speakers are surely aware of the fact that their language choices are being scrutinized and examined by an outside observer, who is most likely known to them as a linguist. This, of course, yields formal results that tend toward greater use of prescriptively ‘correct’ forms. Also, the examples given in questionnaires and form selection tasks do not usually reflect actual speech and are non-contextual, which makes it impossible for respondents to distinguish between the use of one mood form or another. Furthermore, these types of methods limit the possibilities of respondents’ answers, which in and of itself is highly prescriptive. If we are to approach an understanding of the semantic significance of the subjunctive and the pragmatic factors that account for its use, we must use realistic data that accurately portray the forms that speakers choose in natural settings (i.e. when they are not being forced to choose among a closed set of options).
1.3 A variationist perspective on the use of mood

Another approach to the explanation of mood variation in contexts that prescriptively require the use of the subjunctive is that of Poplack (1992), who utilizes a variationist framework (described in Labov, 1971, 1984; Poplack, 1993; Sankoff, 1982, 1988; Wolfram, 1993) in order to establish a hierarchy of constraints that condition the variable use of mood forms. Poplack explains that ‘variationists seek to discover patterns of usage, which pertain to the relative frequency of occurrence or co-occurrence of structures, rather than simply to their existence or grammaticality’ (1993:252). She claims that, in French, for lexical heads of matrix clauses other than *falloir* ‘to have to’ (which is lexically conditioned for the subjunctive), the use of the subjunctive is determined by structural factors found within the utterance. Using a database of vernacular speech from francophone consultants of the Ottawa-Hull region of Canada, she found that four structural factors determine the choice of the subjunctive mood in subordinate nominal clauses. These are: (1) appearance of the imperfect, *passé composé*, present, or future verb tenses in the matrix clause, (2) no distance between the two clauses, (3) morphologically frequent forms of the subordinate verb, and (4) presence of the complementizer *que*. According to this analysis, the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses in which the matrix clause head is not *falloir* is determined primarily by structural factors. De la Puente-Schubeck (1991) utilized a similar approach for the study of mood variation in the Spanish of Albuquerque using 16 social factors and 13 linguistic factors. She found that the subjunctive is favored after *antes que* ‘before’, after clauses expressing volition, uncertainty, finality, and hypothesis, in semiformal speech among older speakers who grew up in Spanish-dominant households. The greatest weakness to this study, as is the case with most other studies of mood variation in Spanish, is that, despite its obvious rigor, examples of subjunctive-indicative variation were collected through a combination of guided interviews and questionnaire data. As with other studies, the motivation for gathering data in this way is to increase the number of tokens, but this is at the expense of capturing informal language use. More recently, a variationist approach to mood variation in Spanish was used by Gudmestad (2010), who examined the variable use of mood forms among 20 native speakers of Spanish. In this analysis, various linguistic factors (form regularity, semantic category, time reference, and hypotheticality) receive attention. Results from a multivariate analysis show that all four variables are statistically significant in the use of subjunctive forms, with semantic category being the most significant, followed by hypotheticality, time reference, and form regularity. Unfortunately, individual factors for each of these variables are not provided. As a result, a relative hierarchy based on ranges of probabilities within factor groups is never established. This information would help to explain the
relative conditioning effects that each variable has on the realization of the dependent variable. Despite several limitations to this approach, it is desirable due to the fact that it explains variation in the use of the indicative and subjunctive in contexts that prescriptively require the subjunctive, but does not make any assumptions about the speaker’s intent or prior knowledge of what is being said.

2 Data and methodology

2.1 Objectives

The purpose of the current study will be to determine the role of social factors in the choice of indicative or subjunctive moods. Since a semantically based examination of mood expression generally leads to assumptions about a speaker’s knowledge or experience of the subject being discussed and cannot be measured quantitatively, I will not try to explain the meaning of the subjunctive as opposed to the indicative nor will speakers’ intentions be addressed. Instead, the current study will focus on social factors that seem to condition the use of mood in the bilingual Spanish of Barelas. Despite the claim that ‘existing research does not provide conclusive evidence on the role of social variables’ (Gudmestad, 2010:41), even though social factors were found to be significant in the conditioning of the subjunctive by de la Puente-Schubeck (1991), there are sound reasons for examining these variables in detail, especially with respect to bilingual speakers of Spanish. The factors that seem to have the greatest conditioning effect on the choice of mood forms are a speaker’s preferred language, age, and to a lesser degree, sex. The inclusion of language preference is crucial to the investigation of mood variation in Spanish-English bilingual communities given that the subjunctive is very uncommonly used in English, especially in informal varieties (Berk, 1999; Fischer, 2003; Kovács, 2009). This may equate with a lower use of the subjunctive by English-dominant speakers. Age is also extremely relevant given numerous findings that show that younger speakers in New Mexico, in general, prefer English over Spanish (Bills, 1997; Bills and Vigil, 1999; Hernández-Chávez, Bills and Hudson, 1996; Hudson, Hernández-Chávez and Bills, 1995). We will see that this is not categorical for all young speakers, however.

2.2 Data collection

The data that will be used for the current study come from the spontaneous speech of 22 bilingual residents of the neighborhood of Barelas, which is located south of downtown Albuquerque, New Mexico. The neighborhood of Barelas consists of a relatively tight-knit group of residents living within a small area. Many of the consultants know each other well, as they live in close proximity to one another, do business together, and associate together in local stores and
restaurants. They also share linguistic norms, which are reflected by commonalities in their speech, namely the use of English-origin loans, code-switching, and calquing. That said, they do not share exactly the same preferences for the use of either Spanish or English nor do they possess exactly the same abilities in both languages. In any bilingual community, speakers have varying preferences for one language or another as well as varying proficiencies in both languages. For this reason, it is important to consider these factors as part of a continuum ranging from stronger preferences and proficiencies in English on one end and stronger preferences and proficiencies in Spanish on the other end (Silva-Corvalán, 2001:270).

Barelas is the ideal location for the research of New Mexican Spanish as both major dialects of this language (a southern dialect marked by features of northern Mexican Spanish and a more traditional dialect that is characteristic of northern New Mexico and southern Colorado) are spoken within the community. Each speaker was recorded in Spanish for approximately one hour, yielding a total of more than 20 hours of recorded conversation. These speech data come from 12 sociolinguistic interviews conducted by the present author (during two weeks of field work in the summer of 2010) and seven interviews conducted by former colleagues at the University of New Mexico (during the fall of 2001). In an attempt to approximate the vernacular, which Labov (1984:29) defines as ‘the most systematic data for linguistic analysis’ in that ‘minimum attention is paid to speech’, various protocols were followed. Most importantly, almost every interview was recorded only after having made initial contact with a consultant. Only a couple of interviews were conducted ‘on the spot’ (i.e. immediately after meeting a consultant). Consultants chose the locations and times of the interviews. They were encouraged to speak about topics that were of particular interest to them and were not discouraged from switching between Spanish and English. No pre-written questions were used in any of the interviews, allowing for spontaneous interaction and fluid discourse. All interviews were recorded with either a lapel-style omnidirectional microphone or an internal microphone as they are unobtrusive and much less noticeable than traditional external microphones. It should be noted that the 2001 interviews were recorded on standard cassettes while the 2010 interviews were recorded as WAV files. After the interviews were conducted, they were transcribed and consolidated into a single document in order to facilitate the process of token extraction.

2.3 Speaker selection
The 22 bilingual speakers chosen for the current study represent the community of Barelas quite well, given that there is a fairly equal representation of speakers by age, sex, and language preference. Furthermore, since Barelas is such a small
community, the total number of consultants chosen seems adequate. The selection of consultants was based on 2000 census data for zip code 87102 (factfinder.census.gov), which includes the neighborhood of Barelas as well as adjoining areas spanning downtown Albuquerque to the north and the South Broadway section of the city to the south. Unfortunately, more specific demographic data for just Barelas are not available. That said, this neighborhood constitutes approximately one quarter of the zip code area and population. According to census data, there are 11,637 men and 10,712 women living in this area of the city. This being the case, an approximately equal number of men and women were chosen for interviews. Data regarding age are not specific enough to be of much use in the determination of consultant selection. Census data only show how many residents are under the age of five, between the ages of 18 and 65, and older than 65. Given the lack of more specific figures with regards to the 18 to 65 year old group, a roughly equal number of female and male consultants was sought for each age category. Language preference was not used as a factor in the selection of consultants since it is highly variable within the community. That is, even speakers who prefer the same language will show varying degrees of preference for a given language, which has precipitated the need to address issues of bilingualism in terms of a fluid continuum (Silva-Corvalán, 2001). The distribution of speakers according to these social factors is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of social characteristics within the community sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A (25–50)</th>
<th>Group B (&gt; 51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The language preferences for each age group mirror findings elsewhere (Bills, 1997; Hernández-Chávez, Bills and Hudson, 1996; Hudson, Hernández-Chávez and Bills, 1995). The older of the two age groups demonstrates a stronger preference for Spanish (N=5) over English (N=2) while the reverse is true for younger consultants. A considerable number of speakers (N=9) do not show any clear preference for either language. While this is to be expected for native-born New Mexicans of older age groups, it is somewhat surprising for younger speakers. It should be noted here, however, that the five speakers from the youngest age group who show no clear language preference are children of Mexican immigrants who were born and raised in Barelas. They, as well as their parents, indicated during interviews and in off-the-record conversations that they
spoke Spanish exclusively in the home while their children were growing up. This would explain, then, the discrepancy that exists with regards to language preference between these speakers and those whose families have always lived in Barelas.

2.4 Data extraction and coding
All instances of subjunctive and indicative inflections for subordinate clause verbs were extracted for the following matrix clauses that express the semantic notions of finality, volition, personal comment, future intention, and uncertainty. The only matrix clause constructions expressing finality are those that precede the subordinating conjunction *para que* ‘so that’. Matrix clauses expressing volition include *esperar que* ‘to hope that’, *querer que* ‘to want that’, *necesitar que* ‘to need that’, *desear que* ‘to desire that’, *prohibir que* ‘to prohibit that’, and *permitir que* ‘to permit that’. For the expression of personal comment, the matrix clauses are *gustar que* ‘to like that’, *es importante que* ‘it is important that’, *es buena idea que* ‘it is a good idea that’, *alegrarse (de) que* ‘to be pleased that’, *encantar que* ‘to be enchanted that’, *fascinar que* ‘to be fascinated that’, *es necesario que* ‘it is necessary that’, *es raro que* ‘it is strange that’, and *es triste que* ‘it is sad that’. Expressions of future intention include *cuando* ‘when’, *hasta que* ‘until’, *después (de) que* ‘after’, *antes (de) que* ‘before’, *tan pronto como* ‘as soon as’, and *en cuanto* ‘as soon as’. It should be noted that since these expressions can be used in the past (in which they do not prescriptively require the use of the subjunctive), only instances with a clear indication of future intention were used in the analysis. The following matrix clauses expressing uncertainty were also examined: *dudar que* ‘to doubt that’, *no creer que* ‘to not believe that’, *no pensar que* ‘to not think that’, *(no) es probable que* ‘it is (not) probable that’, *(no) es posible que* ‘it is (not) possible that’, and *es dudoso que* ‘it is doubtful that’. The semantic expression of doubt *no saber que* ‘to not know that’ was excluded from analysis due to the fact that, even though it can take the subjunctive, it really does seem to take the indicative more often given that speakers use this expression to indicate a lack of knowledge rather than doubt or reservation. It should further be noted that all possible inflections for person, number, and tense were searched for matrix clause verbs. This was accomplished by searching for the complementizers *que* and *cuando* in the constructions just described. A total of 311 tokens were encountered in the corpus. Each instance of mood was coded according to the social factors just described. This low number of occurrences is typical for morphosyntactic studies, especially when analyzing mood constructions according to narrowly defined matrix clause expressions. Limiting the analysis of mood to prescriptively ‘obligatory’ contexts, however, is more methodologically sound than expanding them to include ‘optional’ contexts since mood use in the latter is extremely unpredictable. Due to such a limitation,
this study is by no means the final word on mood variation in the Spanish of Albuquerque, but rather provides an indication of how variable the use of mood actually is in the speech of this city and which social factors seem to be influencing variation.

3 The role of social factors in mood variation

3.1 The variable use of mood in Barelas

Not surprisingly, the frequency of use of the subjunctive in Barelas is relatively low in comparison to that of monolingual varieties of Spanish. Consider, for example, that Blake (1985:168) found that the subjunctive was used after matrix clauses expressing uncertainty at average rates of 87.6% for Mexican speakers and 87% for speakers from Spain. After matrix clauses expressing comment, the subjunctive was used at rates of 89.6% among Mexicans and 84.7% among Spaniards. The overall use of the subjunctive in the Spanish of Albuquerque for the five semantic expressions discussed so far is only 67.8% (211/311). This low frequency of use, however, does parallel that of the bilingual speech community studied in Silva-Corvalán (1994). She found that bilingual speakers of Spanish and English residing in Los Angeles used the subjunctive at a rate of merely 42.6% (430/1010) after matrix clauses for the same semantic expressions studied here. This lower rate of use of the subjunctive may be due to the fact that she included matrix clauses expressing uncertainty followed by the complementizer *si* ‘if’ (e.g. *no sé si* ‘I don’t know if’), which prescriptively require use of the indicative (Butt and Benjamin, 2004:295). The rates of use of the subjunctive according to the five semantic expressions of matrix clauses for the current study are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequency of use of subjunctive forms for subordinate verbs according to the semantic expression of the matrix clause ($X^2 = 17.32, df = 4, p < .05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic expression</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finality</td>
<td>59/75</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volition</td>
<td>76/104</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future intention</td>
<td>40/61</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>29/52</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>7/19</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, use of the subjunctive following the subordinator *para que* ‘so that’ was used very frequently by consultants (at 78.7%). The frequency of this use is also high among the consultants of Silva-Corvalán’s study, who used the subjunctive 76.2% of the time in this context. The subjunctive was used least after matrix clauses expressing uncertainty at only 36.8%. This is also the context which yields the lowest rates of use of the subjunctive among Silva-Corvalán’s Los
Angeles subjects, who used the subjunctive in this context only 19.8% of the time. Though the frequencies of use of the subjunctive in the other contexts for the current study vary slightly from those in Silva-Corvalán’s study, this discrepancy is most likely due to the relatively small number of tokens used for the current study (only 311, compared to her 1,010 tokens within the same contexts). Despite slight differences in the relative frequencies of use of the subjunctive in these contexts, these results clearly show that use of the subjunctive in the Spanish of Albuquerque, as in other bilingual communities, is relatively low.

3.2 Age
The bilingual situation in Barelas parallels that of many communities in New Mexico and other areas of the southwestern United States in that Spanish is being lost at the expense of English, most likely due to the precedence given to English in almost all public endeavors, most notably in schools and places of work (Bills, 1997). In general, each successive generation of bilinguals is using Spanish less than the generation before it. Silva-Corvalán’s study of mood variation in the Spanish of Los Angeles also corroborates this general decline in the use of Spanish, not as a reflex of age per se, but as a result of place of birth and immigration status. As shown in her study, the overall frequency of use of the subjunctive decreases from 42.4% among native-born Mexican immigrants to 26.5% for native-born Angelenos whose parents were both born in Mexico, to a mere 17.3% for native-born Angelenos with at least one parent born in Mexico. Results from de la Puente-Schubeck (1991) mirror these findings, with older speakers (over 46 years of age) using the subjunctive 32% of the time, decreasing to 19% for middle-age speakers (31–45), and only 13% for younger speakers (18–30). Given this evidence, it is necessary to look at the use of the subjunctive by age group to see if similar results are found for the current study which will corroborate previous findings. The consultants for the current study were placed into two age groupings that correspond to different life stages. Group A includes speakers between the ages of 25 and 50 while Group B represents speakers who are 51 years of age or older. For the specific ages of individual consultants, see the appendix. The frequencies of use of the subjunctive for consultants belonging to both age groupings are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Frequency of use of the subjunctive by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A (25-50)</td>
<td>112/166</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B (&gt; 50)</td>
<td>99/145</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = .02, df = 1 p > .05\).
As shown in Table 3, the younger generation uses the subjunctive a surprising 67.5% of the time, which is almost the same rate as that of the older generation. This frequency of use is much higher than expected. Of course, age has been included here as a factor due to the relative lack of Spanish use associated with this generation. When we examine rates of subjunctive use among the two Spanish-dominant speakers from this generation, however, we see that they use the subjunctive at uncharacteristically high rates (80.7%, 67/83) for this generation. Not only do they use the subjunctive more frequently than other members of this generation, they also create the most opportunities in which to use the subjunctive (exactly half of all instances). If these speakers are removed from frequency tabulations for this group, we are left with a more accurate representation of subjunctive use among younger speakers. Out of a total of 83 opportunities for the use of indicative or subjunctive moods, the remaining consultants from Group A use the subjunctive a mere 45 times, at a rate of only 54.2%. This is still much higher than that reported for younger generations by both Silva-Corvalán (1994) and de la Puente-Schubeck (1991). This discrepancy may be due to the author’s out-group status or the size of the sample used for the current study. What is more likely, however, is that the percentages are higher in the current study since the analysis of mood use has been confined to subordinate clauses after matrix expressions that prescriptively require the subjunctive. Both Silva-Corvalán (1994) and de la Puente-Schubeck (1991) analyze the use of mood in these contexts, but also in independent adverbial clauses (e.g. *quizá* ‘perhaps’ and *tal vez* ‘maybe’) as well as in clauses introduced by *si* ‘if’, none of which prescriptively calls for the subjunctive. It is no surprise, then, that these constructions least favor the subjunctive in both of these studies, which obviously skews rates toward less use of the subjunctive overall.

### 3.3 Sex

Speaker sex has been shown to be an important factor in the choice of linguistic variants in numerous studies including Cedergren (1973), Fontanella de Weinberg (1979), Labov (2001), and Rissel (1989). These studies show that women frequently choose prestige variants, whether globally or at the more local level. These are generally more conservative, prescriptive forms. Given these findings, it is expected that women will use the subjunctive more frequently than men. Table 4 shows the frequency of use of the subjunctive overall for men and women for the current study.
Table 4. Frequency of use of the subjunctive according to speaker sex ($X^2 = 1.02$, df = 1, $p > .05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>165/238</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/73</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results do not indicate that women and men use the subjunctive very differently, which is precisely what de la Puente-Schubeck (1991) found (24% for men, 27% for women). However, it should be noted that women use mood-based constructions far more often than men. Each woman for the current study used, on average, 19.8 mood-based constructions while men averaged only 7.3 such constructions. This, of course, gives women more of a chance to select the subjunctive mood, but as Table 4 shows, they choose this mood at rates very similar to those for male consultants. These findings suggest that women, in general, use mood distinctions as a way to signal multiple subtle stances with respect to their perception of future outcomes and the degree to which they are willing to assert certain notions.

3.4 Language preference

The subjunctive has virtually disappeared from use in spoken English (see Kovács, 2009, for a detailed account of the diachronic development of the English subjunctive). Its use is confined to very specific contexts, most notably for the expression of hypothetical situations, and is seen by most native speakers as overly formal and/or archaic. As such, it is likely that bilinguals who prefer English over Spanish and use this language frequently will also use the subjunctive less often than Spanish-dominant bilinguals. Furthermore, given that a firm grasp of appropriate uses of the subjunctive is one of the most difficult skills for language learners of Spanish to acquire, one would expect that English-dominant speakers would use the subjunctive less frequently in favor of the indicative, which is typically learned before the subjunctive and occurs more frequently in discourse. To see whether this is true or not, at least for the current study, it is necessary to look at the frequency of use of the subjunctive according to consultants’ language preferences. Table 5 displays the frequencies of use of the subjunctive according to speakers’ self-attested claims concerning language preference.

Table 5 indicates that language preference may have a conditioning effect on the choice of mood for subordinate clause verbs. English-dominant speakers use the subjunctive much less frequently than Spanish-dominant speakers (at rates of 52.5% and 75.2%, respectively). This finding is similar to what Silva-Corvalán (1994) found for the Spanish of Los Angeles. The influence of English Morphosyntax on the Spanish of many bilingual speakers may be serving to accelerate the loss of mood distinctions that is already taking place in monolingual varieties of
Spanish. That is, the lower frequency of use of the subjunctive by English-dominant speakers seems to be affected by the speakers’ knowledge of English, in which mood distinctions are seldom marked morphologically.

### Table 5. Frequency of use of the subjunctive according to language preference \((X^2 = 12.3, \text{df} = 2, p < .05)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred language</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>106/141</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>106/141</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>63/90</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since English does not distinguish mood in this way, it is plausible to conclude that speakers who prefer this language will use the subjunctive much less frequently than speakers who prefer Spanish. This also implies that speakers with a stronger knowledge of English would be less familiar with the various contexts and uses of the subjunctive in Spanish, unless of course they learned Spanish formally but nonetheless have more experience with English.

In order to gauge the potential conditioning effects of the social factors just analyzed as well as the semantic expression of the matrix clause on the use of the subjunctive, a multivariate analysis using GoldVarb was conducted. GoldVarb, which is a statistical analysis program that generates probability weights corresponding to observed frequencies in a corpus (Lawrence, Robinson and Tagliamonte, 2001), is perfectly suited to the current analysis since it was designed to handle non-continuous dependent variables with two possible applied variants (in this case subjunctive mood or indicative mood). The results from this analysis, in which subjunctive mood was selected as the applied variant, appear in Table 6.

### Table 6. Multivariate analysis of the probabilities of co-occurrence of the subjunctive with the semantic expression of the matrix clause and social factors \((p < .05, N = 311, \text{Input} = 0.692, \text{Log likelihood} = -180.935)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Expression</td>
<td>Finality</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volition</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Range 40</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Preference</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Range 26</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Other factor groups included in analysis: [1] Age and [2] Speaker sex).
These results show that the semantic expression of the matrix clause is the most important factor in the use of the subjunctive. Matrix clauses expressing finality and volition favor the use of the subjunctive while those expressing comment or uncertainty highly disfavor use of the subjunctive. These results are similar to those reported in Silva-Corvalán (1994:265) and de la Puente-Schubeck (1991:147,157). The highest rates of use of the subjunctive among the participants in these studies were in these very same contexts. The subjunctive was used at rates of 83% (Silva-Corvalán’s study) and 73% (de la Puente-Schubeck’s study) after clauses of volition and 76% (Silva-Corvalán’s study) and 82% (de la Puente-Schubeck’s study) after clauses of finality. The easiest way to explain the preference for the subjunctive in these contexts is that expressions of volition and finality are causal in nature and therefore favor use of the subjunctive due to a need to express influence. Likewise, the lack of causality for semantic expressions of comment and uncertainty results in a disfavoring of the use of the subjunctive. Of the three social factors analyzed in the current study, only language preference is statistically significant in the determination of the use of mood. It is statistically likely that speakers who prefer Spanish will use the subjunctive while those who prefer English will likely avoid its use. This can be attributed to the relative lack of use of this mood in English. Since English-dominant speakers may be less familiar with mood distinctions or simply employ them less often in speech, it is highly unlikely that they will select the subjunctive in contexts that require them according to prescriptive grammars of Spanish. This finding provides strong evidence in favor of influence from English in the use of the subjunctive among English-dominant bilinguals in Albuquerque. The simplification of the mood system among bilinguals is most likely a direct result of this influence.

4 Other potential conditioning factors in the choice of mood

It seems highly unlikely that the only social factor influencing the choice of mood in the Spanish of Albuquerque is language preference. As such, it is necessary to analyze other social factors that might condition mood variation. For example, education levels and occupations of each consultant might reveal patterns that correlate with the choice of mood. The age at which consultants began learning their first and second languages could also reveal tendencies toward the greater use of one mood over the other. How long, if ever, have speakers studied both languages? Have they learned one language formally while the other was acquired informally through interactions with family members and friends? The answers to these questions might show patterns in the choice of mood. Unfortunately these data were not solicited directly during interviews since the objective of the interview sessions was to collect as informal a speech sample as possible and questions regarding education and years of language study would likely have formalized
interviews substantially. Almost all interviews, however, include metalinguistic commentaries that address these questions. Since nearly all interviews contain this type of information to varying degrees, I will only be able to provide information about education level, formal instruction in Spanish, age at which language acquisition began, etc. on a case-by-case basis. Information related to speakers’ frequency of use of Spanish and how they acquired this language was gathered through the careful analysis of metalinguistic commentaries provided by consultants during interview sessions. Though the following profiles may not include all information related to these matters, they seem sufficient for making general claims about language learning and use for individual speakers.

5 Speaker profiles

We shall now turn to the aforementioned factors related to language use and acquisition. Following each profile, the frequency with which the consultant used the subjunctive will be given. It should be noted here that profiles will not be included for two male speakers, one of whom did not use any mood-based constructions (Consultant 3) and another who only produced one such construction (Consultant 14). The profiles appear in order from speakers demonstrating least to greatest use of the subjunctive.

Consultant 1 – Learned to speak Spanish informally during his childhood in Barelas. He says that he spoke mostly Spanish at home, but used this language much less often outside of the home, especially at school, where English was used almost exclusively. He currently lives with his wife, who does not speak Spanish. His other daily personal contacts are limited, mostly to his children, all of whom are very much dominant in English. Percentage of subjunctive use = 0% (0/2);

Consultant 7 – Said that she learned to speak Spanish after she married her husband, who is from Chihuahua, Mexico. At the time, she was older than twenty years of age. She has never had any formal instruction in Spanish. Percentage of subjunctive use = 11.1% (2/18);

Consultant 15 – While growing up in Barelas, his parents, who were both born in the neighborhood, spoke to him mostly in Spanish. He claims that he would almost always respond in English. Has not had much formal education and all of it has been in English. Percentage of subjunctive = 20% (1/5);

Consultant 21 – No formal instruction in Spanish. Began learning English at a very early age through Sisters in a Catholic school. Percentage of subjunctive use = 40% (6/15);
Consultant 5 – Grew up speaking Spanish along with several other languages. He is a longtime resident of Barelas. In his daily activities, he speaks mostly English. He said that he started gradually speaking more and more English over the years, particularly as a result of his profession. Percentage of subjunctive = 50% (5/10);

Consultant 16 – Born in Mexico. Did not grow up speaking English, but learned this language while attending Albuquerque High School. Dropped out of high school during her junior year. Percentage of subjunctive use = 50% (6/12);

Consultant 11 – Works at the Hispano Chamber of Commerce in Barelas, where he speaks Spanish frequently. He spoke only Spanish at home with his parents, both of whom were born in Mexico. He has had some formal education in this language. Percentage of subjunctive use = 60% (3/5);

Consultant 20 – No formal instruction in Spanish, but both of her parents spoke only Spanish. Old enough to remember a time when English was hardly spoken in New Mexico. She said in her interview that mostly younger people wanted to learn English because it was being taught in the schools. Percentage of subjunctive use = 60% (9/15);

Consultant 18 – Has never had any formal instruction in Spanish. Forced himself to speak Spanish to his parents (monolingual Spanish speakers). Outside of the home he spoke only English. In his late twenties, he converted to Christianity and became a pastor. Percentage of subjunctive use = 60.9% (14/23);

Consultant 2 – Her parents were both born in Barelas. Said that she hardly speaks Spanish anymore. Since she is retired, she has limited daily contacts, but she does volunteer work, which sometimes involves speaking Spanish. Has had very little formal education in Spanish. Percentage of subjunctive = 66.7% (20/30);

Consultant 9 – Grew up speaking Spanish with monolingual parents in Santa Fe. Moved to Barelas in 1974 with her husband (Consultant 8), who speaks Spanish almost exclusively. She speaks to her grown-up children in Spanish, which was evident in a telephone conversation she had during our interview. She has had considerable formal education in Spanish, though it was a long time ago. Percentage of subjunctive = 66.7% (2/3);
Consultant 10 – Works at Central New Mexico Community College, where she speaks primarily English. Both of her parents were born in Mexico. Growing up, she spoke Spanish at home. Her husband, who was also born in Mexico, speaks Spanish almost exclusively. Has had very limited formal education in Spanish. Percentage of subjunctive = 66.7% (6/9);

Consultant 22 – Born and raised in Barelas. Did not begin to learn English until the second grade. Both of her parents are Mexican. Her mother did not speak English. She said that she would serve as a translator for her mother when necessary. Has had some formal instruction in Spanish. Percentage of subjunctive = 66.7% (10/15);

Consultant 19 – Learned Spanish while growing up, from a very early age, along with English and Italian. Has had much formal education. He has had to study religious texts throughout his career. Percentage of subjunctive use = 68.4% (13/19);

Consultant 12 – Works at the Social Security office in Barelas, where she speaks both languages daily. She spoke only Spanish at home with her parents, both of whom were born in Mexico. She has had some formal education in this language. Percentage of subjunctive = 77.8% (14/18);

Consultant 17 – Born in Mexico City. Did not finish high school and only had three years of schooling after the age of eleven, the age at which she moved to the United States. She had some formal instruction in Spanish by this time. Admitted in the interview that she only wanted to speak Spanish growing up and that she does not speak English well. She is married to a Mexican man and speaks Spanish daily at work with speakers from many different social backgrounds. Percentage of subjunctive use = 85.9% (61/71);

Consultant 4 – Graduated from high school. Born in Belen, New Mexico, but moved to Barelas at a very early age. She is one of the longest-standing residents of the neighborhood. Her parents both spoke Spanish. Speaks Spanish frequently at work in Barelas. Percentage of subjunctive use = 92.6% (25/27);

Consultant 6 – Both parents born and raised in Barelas. He grew up speaking mostly Spanish, but has not had much formal education in this language. He currently lives in a nursing home, where he speaks mainly English. Percentage of subjunctive = 100% (4/4);
Consultant 8 – Grew up speaking Spanish with monolingual parents and still speaks this language almost exclusively. Had considerable formal education in Spanish during his formative years. Percentage of subjunctive = 100% (5/5);

Consultant 13 – Works as a waitress at the Barelas Coffee House, where she often speaks Spanish. Both of her parents were raised in Mexico and are monolingual speakers of Spanish. She speaks exclusively Spanish at home with her parents and primarily Spanish with her fiancée. Has had some formal education in Spanish. Percentage of subjunctive = 100% (4/4).

6 Discussion

As can be seen from the speaker profiles, there seems to be a strong correlation between higher frequencies of use of the subjunctive and formal instruction in Spanish. Each of the speakers who have had at least some formal instruction in Spanish displays a higher use of the subjunctive than those who have not had any formal instruction in this language. As shown by the speaker profiles, 11 of the consultants for the current study (Consultants 11, 2, 9, 10, 22, 19, 12, 17, 6, 8, and 13) have had at least some formal instruction in this language. Six speakers (Consultants 1, 7, 15, 21, 20, and 18) have never had any formal education in Spanish, which they have acquired solely in informal environments (mainly at home). The exposure to formal Spanish via instruction is unclear for Consultants 5, 16, and 4. Now let us compare percentages of subjunctive use for each of the two groups. The group of speakers who have had at least some formal instruction in Spanish produced the subjunctive 77.6% of the time (in 142 out of 183 instances). The group of speakers who have never had any formal instruction in Spanish produced the subjunctive only 41% of the time (in 32 out of 78 instances). Thus, consultants with at least some formal instruction in Spanish produced the subjunctive almost twice as often as consultants who have never had any formal instruction in this language. This finding provides strong evidence that exposure to formal Spanish by way of instruction in this language has an effect on the use of the subjunctive. Either directly or indirectly, those speakers with at least some formal education in Spanish have been exposed to the forms of the subjunctive and the linguistic contexts in which it is used. This is clearly not the case for speakers who have acquired this language informally at home, where the use of formal language is extremely uncommon. As the ‘proper’ use of mood is highly prescriptive, and the subjunctive is taught as being categorical within most contexts, it seems likely that speakers with formal education in Spanish would use...
the subjunctive in a much more categorical manner. In fact, this is the case for Consultants 4, 6, 8, 13, and 17. This nearly categorical use of the subjunctive, of course, is characteristic of educated speech, which is reflected in the speaker profiles provided in section 5.

In previous research on the variation in mood found in subordinate clauses following matrix clauses expressing doubt, it has been shown that a correlation exists between the use of the subjunctive and high levels of education. Waltermire (2004) looked at two corpora of data (Habla Culta and Habla Popular) from monolingual Spanish speakers from Mexico City. The following tables show a clear differentiation in the frequencies of use of the subjunctive between highly educated speakers (Habla Culta) and less educated speakers (Habla Popular). Table 7 shows the distribution of mood in subordinate clauses preceded by matrix clauses expressing doubt.

**Table 7.** Distribution of mood use in subordinate clauses preceded by a matrix clause expressing doubt in the Habla Culta and Habla Popular corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Habla Culta (N=35)</th>
<th>Habla Popular (N=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>34.3% (12/35)</td>
<td>42.9% (6/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>65.7% (23/35)</td>
<td>57.1% (8/14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only do more highly educated speakers create more opportunities for the use of mood, they use the subjunctive more frequently than less educated speakers. Thus, even for native, monolingual Spanish speakers, the use of the subjunctive is dictated to a certain degree by prescriptive, learned rules of the language. More educated speakers also use the subjunctive with higher frequencies than less educated speakers do after adverbs expressing possibility (such as posiblemente, tal vez, quizás, and acaso, all of which can roughly be translated as 'perhaps'). These results are shown in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Distribution of mood in adverbial clauses expressing doubt (excluding a lo mejor) in the Habla Culta and Habla Popular corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Habla Culta (N=20)</th>
<th>Habla Popular (N=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>45.0% (9/20)</td>
<td>77.8% (7/9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>55.0% (11/20)</td>
<td>22.2% (2/9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the use of mood in these types of constructions is highly variable even according to prescriptive grammars (see Butt and Benjamin, 2004:251, who refer to the use of the subjunctive in these contexts as 'optional'), more highly educated speakers use the subjunctive more than twice as often as less educated speakers.
and likewise create twice as many opportunities for the use of mood. Given that these data show a correlation between the use of the subjunctive and level of education, it seems plausible to suggest that this same factor is influencing the higher frequency of use of the subjunctive among bilingual speakers as well.

7 Conclusion

Many documented sociolinguistic phenomena indicate that speakers use linguistic forms and structures that are not considered to be grammatically ‘correct’. The fact that these uses are deemed as such is that ‘correct’ forms correlate with prescriptive rules that often do not affect the ability to communicate in any way. These prescriptive rules are generally learned and therefore occur more frequently in the speech of highly educated individuals. This certainly seems to be the case with the variable use of mood in both monolingual and bilingual dialects of Spanish. Prescriptive rules state that the subjunctive must be used obligatorily in certain contexts. However, the use of the subjunctive within these contexts is highly variable. It is very likely that pragmatic considerations motivate the use of the indicative in these contexts as many theorists have claimed, but this is very difficult to prove and would nonetheless be considered ‘incorrect’ according to prescriptive rules of the language. This is reflected in the fact that even highly educated speakers show variation in the use of the subjunctive in these contexts. The frequency of use of the subjunctive among these speakers, however, is much higher than that of less educated speakers. It seems that the use of the subjunctive might, therefore, be a marker of prestige and high social status rather than a strictly linguistic function in which semantic notions are affected by pragmatic factors, as other authors have claimed. Furthermore, since the myriad uses of the subjunctive must be learned, it makes sense that Spanish-dominant bilinguals who have had at least some formal education in this language would use the subjunctive more often than English-dominant individuals who have learned Spanish informally. Although the current study does not encompass all dialects of the Spanish language and in no way purports to explain the social conditioning of mood variation in its totality, the results of this study serve as an indication that the use of the subjunctive is indeed a social phenomenon. While only language preference was determined to be statistically significant in the use of mood, it is important to recognize that women create far more opportunities for the use of mood than men. Further study of the social factors conditioning mood variation in Spanish needs to be conducted in order to corroborate some of the claims made in the current study. If similar results are found for other dialects, monolingual and bilingual alike, we will have a much better understanding of the social distribution of mood forms in this language.
Notes

1. The most variable contexts for the use of mood are in subordinate clauses following matrix clauses expressing future intention, uncertainty, and personal commentary. These contexts have received the most attention from linguists and are even the contexts described as variable by more prescriptive accounts of the grammar such as those of Butt and Benjamin (2004), Kattán-Ibarra and Pountain (1997), and Lunn and DeCesaris (1992).

2. Sastre Ruano (1997:61–7) distinguishes two types of verbs with respect to the expression of mood. Group 1 verbs express understanding and mental activity (without marking of volition or desire), communication, and physical perception. Group 2 verbs indicate desire, volition, influence, and judgment.

3. Barelas covers about ten square blocks south of downtown Albuquerque, running north and south from Coal Avenue to Avenida César Chávez and east and west from 2nd Street to 12th Street.

4. The most recent field work would not have been possible without the generous support of both the Southwest Borders and Cultures Institute and the Fabián Samaniego Foundation. Older interviews were conducted by Jessi Aaron, Matt Alba, Jens Clegg, Margarita Keller, Irena Nezic, Lis Ovando, and Damián Vergara Wilson.

5. The exception to the general optionality of mood after clauses introduced by si ‘if’ is for hypothetical constructions, which do require the subjunctive according to prescriptive grammars of Spanish.

6. It should be noted that for a couple of speakers interviewed as part of the 2001 field work, dominant language had to be inferred by the interviewers. Since the interviewers did not ask the speakers for this information directly, it was inferred through linguistic and extralinguistic information given during discourse (such as frequency of language mixing in which portions of language use could be compared, the age at which a speaker began to learn a language, domains of language use and frequency of use in these domains, etc.).

7. Formal instruction in Spanish here refers to exposure to this language in school at any level of instruction. This experience with the language differs greatly from the informal acquisition of a language in strictly home environments. Formal instruction in Spanish, of course, does not guarantee explicit instruction regarding the use of mood. It does lead to clearer distinctions between formal and informal uses of language, however, and the structures that characterize them.

8. There are surely pragmatic motivations for the use of the indicative in contexts that prescriptively require the subjunctive, but these are never considered in formal instruction.

9. The total word counts for each of the corpora are very similar. In the Habla Culta corpus, there are a total of 167,083 words while in the Habla Popular corpus there are 172,699 words.

10. The adverbial a lo mejor ‘perhaps’ was excluded from analysis since prescriptive norms require the indicative after its use (Butt and Benjamin, 2004:252). This was found for speakers of both corpora, who used the indicative in this context over 90% of the time.
Appendix

Summary of the socio-demographic information for the 22 consultants used in the data set (including sex, age, and language preference).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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