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Abstract

This dissertation provides an overview of the current sociolinguistic situation of Bilingual Miami (Florida) and a detailed linguistic analysis of the usage of Spanish subjunctive verb forms among Miami Cubans. Informal oral interviews were conducted with thirty Cuban-origin speakers of first, second and third generations. First generation speakers were considered those Spanish monolinguals or Spanish-dominant bilinguals who came to Miami from Cuba as adults; second generation speakers were those Spanish-English bilinguals who came to Miami from Cuba in preadolescence or who were born in the US; third generation comprised those Spanish-English bilinguals who were born in Miami and had at least one parent who corresponded to the second generation.

The research questions were: 1) How does usage of the subjunctive in distinct linguistic contexts compare across three generations of Spanish speakers living in a bilingual context such as Miami?; 2) In categorical and variable contexts where the subjunctive does not appear, what verb forms replace it?; 3) How might the use of a different verb form semantically and pragmatically affect the meaning of the utterance?

Findings of the study revealed that, cross-generationally, there is 1) expansion of the indicative in place of the subjunctive in variable discourse contexts conditioned by specific semantic factors and, 2) expansion of the past subjunctive in place of the conditional indicative in hypothetical discourse contexts. In categorical contexts of usage (except volition), the subjunctive forms were found in second and third generation speech with the same frequency as in first generation speech.
These findings suggest that the processes of reduction and simplification attested by Silva-Corvalán (1994) in the Spanish verb system of successive generations of Los Angeles Mexicans are the same ones also affecting the verb system of successive generations of Cuban Spanish speakers in Miami. However, the rate at which simplification occurs in Miami Cuban Spanish appears to be slower than in Los Angeles Mexican Spanish.

The issue of language maintenance and loss in the Miami context, as it relates to the fields of bilingualism, contact, and language variation, is addressed in the discussion of the findings.
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Chapter One

Introduction to the Study

The situation of Spanish speakers in the United States has received much attention in the past three decades from many realms of our society and our institutions: political, educational, economic, and social. By the year 2010, those who identify themselves as Hispanics will surpass U.S. African-Americans to become the most numerous minority group in the country (Torres 1997).

At the societal level, there have been widespread debates around Hispanic cultural 'assimilation' and the socioeconomic 'integration' of Hispanic minority groups in the U.S. context, in urban and rural settings alike (Chávez 1991). In what seems a social response to the appreciable Hispanic immigrations of the 1980s, English-only initiatives moved to state and federal-level political arenas nationwide. Inherent in these initiatives is the American majority's belief that English Only is equated with being American, and that without the English language, American culture, society, and politics may quickly disintegrate. Since 1980, 20 states have adopted Official English laws, and bilingual education programs concurrently have come under attack (Brisk 1998, Krashen 1999). In the legal and educational spheres, the issue of linguistic rights and language-based discrimination has been fervently argued (Valdés 1990, 1995b, Zentella 1995, 1996).

However new, the debate over Spanish in U.S. public life stems from a sociohistorical reality that some U.S. Americans willfully overlook: the long-standing presence of the Spanish language within the contemporary borders of the United States and the country's
intimate historical relationship with the Spanish colonies and modern-day Mexico and the Caribbean. Klee (1991) observed that "... in the United States, in spite of the fact that Spanish has been spoken since 1536, it is an 'oppressed language' with respect to English" (6).


The findings of these studies must certainly reflect the sociolinguistic realities of the speakers and geographic contexts in

---

1 See Torres 1991 for a discussion of theoretical and methodological issues and caveats of sociolinguistic studies of Spanish in the U.S.
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which they were carried out. In this sense, there are no sociolinguistic truths, but merely methodologically-based interpretations of the realities lived by the limited number of speakers who constitute the data corpus. As such, it seems highly fallacious to generalize to the greater U.S. context the findings of any study or collection of studies carried out in different geographic spaces among speakers of highly disparate social, economic, cultural, and racial backgrounds. The term 'U.S. Spanish' misrepresents the reality of the Spanish language within the political borders of the U.S., since the principal national immigrant groups which actually constitute 'U.S. Spanish' are far from being limited to one or even two. They represent a vast and complex array of historical, social, and economic motivations; these phenomena are the hallmark of sociolinguistic research. These comments foregoing, I turn to the project developed in the remaining pages of this dissertation.

1. Purpose

The present research is focused on Cuban-origin speakers of the middle socioeconomic class who immigrated to or were born in Metropolitan Miami, Florida. Miami may be considered, in political, economic and sociolinguistic terms, the most dynamic bilingual metropolitan area in the U.S. (Américas 1992, Olson and Olson 1995), yet as Resnick (1988) pointed out, “this dynamic community has received little attention from researchers in the sociology of language” (89). This dissertation seeks to further, albeit to a small extent, our knowledge and understanding of Spanish language usage and the issue of Spanish

---

2 Throughout this dissertation I will use the terms 'Miami', 'Metropolitan Miami' and 'Miami-Dade' synonymously in reference to the city of Miami along with the remaining municipalities which constitute the present-day Miami metropolitan area located in the County of Miami-Dade, Florida.
language maintenance among Cuban immigrants and their successive
generations in the Miami context.

While scholars such as Solé (1979, 1982) and García and Otheguy
(1988) have pointed to the loss of Spanish among second and third
generations of Cubans in Miami based on observation and self-reports
of language use, others such as Resnick (1988), Roca (1991), and Lambert
and Taylor (1996) have recognized the unique social, political and
economic situation of Spanish in Miami and have highlighted the
possibility that Spanish among successive generations of Miami
Cubans will be maintained well into the future. In the midst of this
debate, however, a fundamental piece of evidence seems lacking, be it
in favor of a positive or a negative response to the question, "Do
Miami Cubans maintain their Spanish?" This fundamental evidence,
I believe, is empirical evidence based on the actual recorded speech
and/or the unmonitored writing of a sample of second and third
generation Cubans in Miami.\(^3\) The present study offers such evidence.

2. The problem

The analyses presented in the following pages are limited to one aspect
of language proficiency and usage, selected from amidst the widely
complex and highly intricate arrangement of factors and variables
operating on a number of linguistic levels to constitute what abstractly
may be called 'Miami Cuban Spanish', a variety that seems far from
achieving standardization in its actual context. Beatriz Varela, an
internationally recognized scholar of 'Cuban-American Spanish',
highlighted in her 1992 book, *El español cubano-americano*, a number

\(^3\) Throughout this dissertation I will use the terms 'successive generations', 'second and third
generation Cubans' and 'Cuban-Americans' synonymously to refer to those English-Spanish
bilinguals who either immigrated to Miami from Cuba during pre-adolescent childhood or were
born and grew up in Miami.
of linguistic phenomena characteristic of this Spanish variety. Among these phenomena, she identified the replacement of the subjunctive by the indicative mood among Cuban-American Spanish speakers. This dissertation seeks to consider the extent of this linguistic process and ultimately address how it may be implicated in the question of language maintenance and/or loss of the Spanish system among second and third generation speakers in Miami.

The analysis of mood distinction, and inherently hypothetical/irrealis discourse, may offer great insight into two important areas of consideration relevant to Spanish language maintenance in any contact situation: 1) the incipient effects of contact of the Spanish linguistic system with that of another language which does not contain the indicative/subjunctive opposition, such as American English, and 2) the intergenerational transmission of a concomitantly distinct complex of variables with respect to mood selection as the speakers cognitively adapt the Spanish system to the bilingual situation or ultimately shift to exclusive use of the language in competition.

The analysis of mood variability in the Spanish contact situation with a non-Romance language throws light on a number of syntactic, lexical, semantic and pragmatic variables in the Spanish language and offers insight into the linguistic ability of the speakers under study. In general, the ability to precisely express irrealis notions, psycholinguistically far removed from the speaker-now reality, may reflect a high level of proficiency in any particular language. The expression of irrealis concepts is considered to be a cognitively demanding task, even more so than narration of past events (Levett 1979, 1982, Silva-Corvalán 1994b). Silva-Corvalán (1994b) stated that

---

4 According to the ACTFL guidelines for second language learners, ‘superior’ level proficiency is characterized by the ability to produce hypothetical discourse.
"to examine hypothetical discourse it becomes necessary to discuss... the modal value of verb morphology, in addition to the specific contribution of modal verbs...." (77).

In the present study, subjunctive usage is specifically analyzed. In light of much previous theoretical and empirical research treating the Spanish subjunctive (selectively reviewed in Chapter Two of this dissertation), distinct semantic contexts of usage were quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed in the present study. It is important that we consider mood selection by focusing on the various possible discourse contexts in which it is expected to appear (categorical contexts) in non-contact varieties of modern-day Spanish and those in which it is alternately used (variable contexts) with the indicative mood in non-contact varieties of modern-day Spanish.

The ultimate aims of the present inquiry were to shed light on the processes of variability of the Spanish verb system in a contact situation with English and, second, to address the question of Spanish language maintenance and/or loss relative to the verb system of successive generations of Spanish speakers. Silva-Corvalán (1994b) has suggested that bilinguals simplify the Spanish system due to the demands of cognitive load: "...the general hypothesis investigated is that in language-contact situations bilinguals develop strategies aimed at lightening the cognitive load of having to remember and use two different linguistic systems" (207).\(^5\) The present investigation will address this hypothesis.

\(^5\)The strategies identified by Silva-Corvalán are simplification, overgeneralization, analysis, and transfer (direct and indirect).
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3. Organization

This dissertation is organized in the following way: Chapter Two, "Acquisition and variation of the subjunctive forms in Modern-day Spanish: Theoretical and empirical considerations," describes various theoretical and empirical approaches taken in the study of subjunctive use in Spanish. In the first section, theoretical conceptualizations of the subjunctive in modern-day Spanish are discussed relative to syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels of analysis. Section two of Chapter Two selectively reviews the studies to-date on acquisition and use of the subjunctive in Spanish as both a first and second language. These findings are ultimately compared with the basic conclusions of a number of studies investigating subjunctive usage by successive generations of Spanish speakers in the U.S. context. I also point out that there are no existing studies in published form which treat the situation of the Spanish verb system of bilinguals in the Miami context, despite a wide range of research inquiries into the Spanish of the Southwest, Mexican-American Spanish in California and in Chicago, and Puerto Rican Spanish in New York. The research questions which guided the present investigation of Miami Cuban Spanish are stated in the final section of Chapter Two.

Chapter Three, "Spanish-speaking Miami in sociolinguistic perspective," carefully develops the notion of Miami as a fully bilingual social setting. In the first section, the formation of Spanish-speaking Miami is described. A brief history of Cuban immigration in Miami from 1960 to the present day is offered, along with that of Miami's second principal national Hispanic constituent, the Nicaraguans. Population counts and geographic data are provided in this section. In the second section of Chapter Three, a discussion of the theoretical criteria in support of appropriately defining Miami as 'bilingual' is developed. I establish in this section that within the
social context of Miami, Spanish may be considered a competitive language with English in most realms of public life. Section three describes the polemic which has seemingly developed around the future of the Spanish language in Miami at both the societal and familial levels. In conclusion, I indicate that the present-day situation of Spanish in Miami seems conducive to future cross-generational maintenance, and more assuredly to societal-level maintenance.

Chapter Four focuses on the present linguistic investigation and explains the methodology followed. In the first section, the present sample of thirty speakers is described, and in the second section, the instrumentation used to respond to the research questions is highlighted. Sections three and four describe the data collection procedures and the data analysis procedures, respectively.

The findings of the quantitative data analyses are stated in the first section of Chapter Five. Tables displaying frequencies of usage and the results of statistical tests are included in this section. Section two then reveals the qualitative findings of the study and describes the variability observed in the discourse contexts which showed statistical significance for between-group differences of usage. Chapter Five ultimately leads to the suggestion that the variability found in the oral and written data of successive generations is indicative of processes internal to the Spanish system.

In Chapter Six, I highlight that the foregoing observation constitutes basis for the claim that the Spanish mood system in second and third generation Miami Cuban Spanish is not 'lost' per se, but that variability develops within particular discourse contexts, conditioned by specific semantic factors. This variability leads to a more simplified system of usage among successive generations. I conclude the present study by responding to the maintenance/loss question in the Cuban Miami context, and addressing pedagogical implications for Spanish for
Introduction

Native/Heritage Speaker education. Limitations of the present inquiry and directions for future research are also stated in Chapter Six.
Chapter Two

Acquisition and variation of the subjunctive forms in modern-day Spanish:
Theoretical and empirical considerations

Introduction

Subjunctive usage in Spanish has been called a "twilight zone" (Studerus 1981, Keenan 1994), probably because of its high variability. This variability has been widely documented not only in language contact research on Spanish in the U.S., but also in sociolinguistic studies carried out in non-contact regions of the Spanish-speaking World. In the research relevant to the acquisition of Spanish both as a first and second language, the difficulty and late acquisition of an adult-level native-like repertoire for subjunctive usage has been widely attested as well.

The present chapter reflects an attempt to synthesize principal theoretical and methodological conceptualizations of the subjunctive and provide a selective review of empirical studies treating variation of the subjunctive in modern-day Spanish. In an effort to provide a more complete understanding of this grammatical "twilight zone," inquiries from the fields of Spanish in the U.S., acquisition of Spanish as a first language, acquisition of Spanish as a second language, and language variation in modern-day non-contact varieties are all visited. What follows is not an exhaustive review of the literature on subjunctive usage, but rather a synthesis of the theoretical discussions and empirical findings to-date which most appropriately define the approach taken in the analyses and interpretations of the present study reported in subsequent chapters.
1. Theoretical approaches to the Spanish subjunctive

The Spanish subjunctive has been analyzed through approaches focused at three linguistic levels: syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Prior to the 1970s and the appearance of Terrell and Hooper’s (1974) now widely cited article on the semantic basis of Spanish mood distinction, analysis and conceptualization of the Spanish subjunctive took into account purely syntactic considerations. During the 1970s, articles which focused on the crucial role of semantics in determining mood appeared, and by the 1980s with the work of Guitart (1982), Lavandera (1983), and Lunn (1989), the pragmatic level was also highlighted as a principal determining factor of the subjunctive mood. In this section, I will highlight selected articles treating each of these levels of analysis: syntactic (1.1), semantic (1.2), and pragmatic (1.3). I will briefly address the strengths and weaknesses of each level of analysis.

1.1 Syntactic analysis of the Spanish subjunctive. Traditional syntactic analyses considered that the appearance of the subjunctive in a subordinate clause was grammatically motivated by the content of the matrix clause (Farley 1970, Cresse 1971, Shawl 1975). According to this level of analysis, the subjunctive or indicative mood occurs in a subordinate/complement clause depending on the class of verb found in the matrix. For some instances of subjunctive usage in Spanish this matrix-dependent explanation is sufficient. For example, subjunctive categorically follows matrix clauses such as *querer que*... and it also categorically appears in contexts following *para que*. Gili Gaya (1969) maintained that the Spanish subjunctive is basically subordinate, and expresses a subjective point of view which is dependent on a matrix
verb which is [+IRREALIS]. In this way, it expresses doubt, possibility, volition, necessity.

While syntactic analyses are convincing in the contexts of categorical subjunctive usage, they cannot explain its variable usage with the indicative in a great number of other contexts, such as dubitative and emotive contexts. For example, I could maintain that the matrix verb creer que requires indicative usage, since it suggests certainty, and the matrix no creer que requires a subjunctive form, since it demonstrates doubt. But such a categorical rule fails to explain why it is possible to use the indicative as well as the subjunctive after the matrix no creer que, and even in some discourse contexts following creer que. For consideration, (1) Creo que viene María; (2) ¿Crees que venga María?; (3) No creo que venga María; and (4) No creo que viene María. Also acceptable for speakers of some modern varieties are the structures Me alegro de que viene María, and Me alegro de que venga María (Blake 1981). Since all of these are possible within particular discourse contexts, the realis/irrealis contrast criterion suggested by Gili Gaya (1969) for the matrix verb is inapplicable in these cases. The variation presented seems best explained at the semantic level.

1.2 Semantic analysis of the Spanish subjunctive. Terrell and Hooper published their "Semantically Based Analysis of Mood in Spanish" in 1974, an explanation which has served as the frame of reference for numerous semantic and pragmatic approaches appearing in the last two decades. They conceived the indicative/subjunctive distinction in Spanish as one based on three conceptual semantic characteristics:
assertion, presupposition, or neither. Their proposed system was the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>(Class)</th>
<th>(verb mood)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSERTION</td>
<td>Assertion</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESUPPOSITION</td>
<td>Mental act</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this model, assertions (*Sé que va a venir*) and reports (*Dicen que va a venir*) and mental acts (*Entiendo que va con nosotros*) warrant use of the indicative, while doubts (*Dudo que venga*), imperatives (*Venga*), and comments (*Qué pena que venga*) warrant use of the subjunctive. As such, negation would affect the truth value of an assertion, but would not affect the truth value of a presupposition. For example, in the assertion, *Sé que va a venir*, negation affects the truth value of the statement: *No sé si va a venir*. But in the presupposition, *Es bueno que venga*, negation does not reverse the truth value: *No es bueno que venga*.

Although more comprehensive than purely syntactic models, Terrell and Hooper's framework still left some variability unaccounted for, such as in the context *Es bueno que venga /Es bueno que viene*. In a follow-up article, Terrell (1976) further distinguished between 'weak presupposition' and 'strong presupposition' to account for the remaining variability. He concluded that assertions and weak

---

1 An 'assertion' was defined by Terrell and Hooper (1974) as a proposition expressed in a declarative sentence.
presuppositions take the indicative form, and non-assertions and strong presuppositions take the subjunctive form. In this way, _Me alegro de que viene María_ would constitute a weak presupposition in the complement, i.e. a higher degree of assertion, and _Me alegro de que venga María_ would implicate stronger presupposition. He classified factives as strong presuppositions, semifactives as weak presuppositions, opinions as announcing assertions, reporting as indirect assertions, doubts as non-assertion, and volition as imperatives requiring subjunctive.

In addition, Terrell explained that all classes of assertive matrices allow complement preposing, in accordance with Bolinger's (1968) principle of post-position. Bolinger's principle stated that if a matrix clause can be sensibly post-posed, the construction is one which does not require the subjunctive. The problem with this sort of analysis, however, is that it relies on making English contrasts. For example:

---

Creo que viene. — I believe he's coming.  
OR  
He's coming, I believe.  

No creo que venga.— I don't believe he's coming.  
BUT NOT  
He's coming, I don't believe.

---

Lantolf (1978) determined that U.S. Puerto Rican Spanish speakers permit indicative in comment clauses, and Blake (1981) documented the preferred usage of indicative after _Me alegro de que_ matrix clauses in adult monolingual Spanish speakers in Mexico City. Why does this variation exist? In these cases, both semantic and syntactic explanations do not seem convincing. As for the Puerto
Ricans in Lantolf’s (1978) study, the author suggested that mood is determined by the type of information that a speaker wishes to relate through a particular proposition. He suggested that, in his data, mood distinction is meaningful even in statements implying volition. He found high rates of variability and preferential use of the indicative in complements following dubitative types of matrix verbs. Interestingly, he also found that age was a factor determining variable usage in the data: younger speakers were more likely to allow indicative in all categories than older speakers.

Lantolf’s (1978) and Blake’s (1981) study are suggestive of two trends in modern Spanish language usage. First, as for Blake’s study, the high frequency of the indicative in Me alegro de que complements is an indication that the subjunctive in certain contexts, e.g. dubitative and comment complements, represents a feature of instability in the modern-day language. In this way, the variation may be indicative of the evolutionary reduction of subjunctive in the Spanish language (Veidmark & Umana Aguilar 1991, Gutiérrez 1994, Blas Arroyo 1997), accepting the Labovian theoretical notion that synchronic variation leads to diachronic change. Second, as for Lantolf’s (1978) study, the finding that younger speakers preferentially used the indicative more than older speakers could be attributed to the subjunctive’s instability and also, importantly, to the situation of Spanish contact with English, since Lantolf’s subjects were Puerto Ricans living in New York, and not Puerto Ricans living on the Island. In this way, although they represented native speakers, they represented native speakers of a contact variety.

Silva-Corvalán (1990, 1994a, 1994b) has posited that the processes of simplification and change in the Spanish varieties spoken by U.S. bilinguals reflect changes internal to the Spanish system which are accelerated due to the situation of contact with another language, and
that the situation of Spanish and English contact in the U.S. does not necessarily lead to changes motivated by the direct influence of English. Mood distinction is one such feature of the Spanish language. While the theory of transfer or direct influence from English would indeed support the reduced usage of the subjunctive forms in Spanish (since, in everyday American English, they are neither evident nor transparent), such a theory would fail to explain the retained usage of the subjunctive in certain contexts like quiero que and para que, and the retention of present subjunctive forms by third-generation Spanish speakers whose general level of proficiency is notably lower than first- or second-generation speakers. It seems that if the direct transfer of English were the rule in the contact situation of Spanish in the U.S., the subjunctive forms would be lost proportionately, by frequency of usage, across all syntactic and semantic contexts. This however, is not the reality reflected in the findings of studies to-date, suggesting that pragmatic factors must also be at play. A pragmatic-level explanation could offer greater insight into the non-variable usage of the subjunctive in certain syntactic constructions.

1.3 Pragmatic analysis of the Spanish subjunctive. Lavandera's (1983) work opened analysis of the subjunctive to considerations of the discourse context. By doing so, she was able to account for further variation which previous analyses at the clause and sentence level had been unable to explain. She suggested that the subjunctive is used as a discourse strategy. Her notions reflected the original semantic concepts of Terrell and Hooper (1974) which postulated that assertion requires indicative form and non-assertion (or presupposition) requires subjunctive form:
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[+ASSERTION] = indicative mood  
[-ASSERTION] = subjunctive mood

Rather than limiting this concept to the sentence (semantic) level, she extended it to the discourse level. Her study (1983) analyzed argumentative style in oral data from monolingual Buenos Aires Spanish speakers. She posited that, often, an utterance in the subjunctive is one that has previously been asserted or will be asserted later in the argument, i.e. it is a repetition of an idea previously put forth, or an anticipation of an idea to be stated later. This would also inherently suggest that a principle of [+KNOWN] vs. [-KNOWN] content were functioning at the discourse level to determine usage of the subjunctive. Guitart (1982), in a previous study, also suggested that for bilingual Spanish-English speakers in the U.S., [+KNOWN] prompts occurrence of the subjunctive, and [-KNOWN] prompts occurrence of the indicative. DeMello (1974) suggested the same as a constraint in 'el hecho de que' complements in monolingual varieties of Spanish throughout Latin America.

Another pragmatic notion posited by Lavandera (1983) was the notion of relevance in argumentative style. She suggested that shifting moods (subjunctive/indicative) in discourse reflects a strategy of, first, presenting an issue (subjunctive, i.e. to reflect its irrelevance), then, later, dismissing it as irrelevant (indicative, i.e. it is an assertion made by the speaker). For example, she offers the following statements from the speech of a Buenos Aires speaker discussing political movements. First, the speaker said, "No es porque yo vea (subjunctive) mal el comunismo" and later justified, 'no lo veo (indicative) mal" (220). She also observed that, in her data, those facts expressed with the subjunctive represented the facts of least relevance to the argument.
The subjunctive of fact (Fish 1963, Lipski 1978) represents yet another phenomenon relevant to mood distinction which belies the realis/irrealis dichotomy supposedly governing subjunctive usage (Gili Gaya 1969).

Lunn (1989) further developed Lavandera's (1983) notions of assertion and relevance through a 'principle of relevance' which maintained that propositions which are non-assertions, i.e. [-ASSERTION] will require the subjunctive, but situations which are assertions, i.e. [+ASSERTION] will also require the subjunctive if their content is irrelevant or "less than optimally" relevant, i.e. [-RELEVANT]. Lunn (1989) offered the following example to explain the double possible meaning conveyed by the subjunctive in the proposition:

"Aunque esté (subjunctive) forrado el tío, no me casaré con él."
1. Although the guy might turn out to be loaded, I won't marry him. [-ASSERTION]
2. So what if the guy's loaded? I won't marry him. [+ASSERTION] BUT [-RELEVANT], so the subjunctive is used

Another example would be:
"Vamos a llamar aunque sea la una de la mañana."
1. We're going to call even though it might be one in the morning. [-ASSERTION]
2. We're going to call even though it's one in the morning. [+ASSERTION] BUT [-RELEVANT]

This principle of relevance explains what Terrell and Hooper's (1974) model could not encompass.
Lunn (1989) also observed that the appearance of the indicative in discourse serves to place emphasis or call attention to the content of a proposition, and subjunctive may serve to de-emphasize or background, in a sense, the value of the information expressed in the proposition. According to Lunn, this could further explain why in these variable contexts, the subjunctive is late-learned in both L1 and L2 acquisition.

Taking into consideration the notions pursued through syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic approaches, we may suggest that investigation of the acquisition and variation of the subjunctive in modern-day Spanish is best carried out by carefully considering all three levels. One level of analysis may well reveal some trend or tendency which another level of analysis could not encompass or explain. While pragmatic (discourse) and semantic (sentence-level) analyses seem to explain more fully the variability of the Spanish subjunctive, it cannot be dismissed that subjunctive seems impermeable to change or variability in certain syntactic constructions, most notably after querer que and para que. Indeed, these are the contexts for subjunctive which are first acquired by L1 and L2 speakers of Spanish, as suggested by previous studies which I will consider in the next section on L1 and L2 acquisition of Spanish subjunctive.

2. Acquisition and use of the subjunctive in Spanish as a first and second language: Empirical findings

A synthesis of first language (L1) and second language (L2) acquisition studies reveals that in the case of the Spanish subjunctive, both L1 (monolingual and English-Spanish bilingual children) and L2 (English-speaking L1) learners reflect strikingly similar patterns and rates of acquisition. At the same time, it appears that the contexts in which the
subjunctive is last acquired by L1 children and L2 adult learners represent the same contexts which are most permeable to simplification, in favor of the indicative, among successive generations of Spanish-English bilinguals living in the U.S. In this section, I will first highlight those relevant L1 studies (2.1) and L2 studies (2.2) treating acquisition of the Spanish subjunctive, and then compare their findings to what we know about subjunctive usage by successive generations of Spanish speakers in the U.S. (2.3).

2.1 The subjunctive in Spanish first language acquisition. Studies addressing the acquisition of Spanish by monolingual children have suggested that it is a feature which appears late in language development (Floyd 1990). In a study of preschool to fourth-grade Puerto Rican children, Gili Gaya (1972) observed that, for preschoolers, the great majority of subjunctive forms occurred in purpose clauses, e.g. *para que*.... In all other contexts, subjunctive usage was either nonexistent or highly infrequent. Thus, he maintained that the purpose context was the apparent semantic point of entrance for the subjunctive into the children's speech. Among first graders, subjunctive usage appeared consistently and frequently in purpose clauses and in volitional contexts, e.g. *quiero que*.... In the speech of second and third graders, he observed that subjunctive usage began to appear in conditional sentences and in adverbial clauses introduced by *cuando*, as frequency of usage in purpose and volitional contexts continued to increase.

While frequencies of usage in the above mentioned contexts did increase as grade level increased, Gili Gaya (1972) found that even in the speech of the fourth graders, there was only rare and highly sporadic appearance of subjunctive forms in dubitative, e.g. *dudo que*..., and emotive, i.e. *me alegro de que*..., semantic contexts. His
conclusion, thus, was that subjunctive usage in the dubitative and emotive contexts is late-learned, certainly at some time after fourth grade. González's (1975) study of Texas bilingual children confirmed Gili Gaya's (1972) findings that dubitative expression employing subjunctive is a late-learned facet of Spanish L1 acquisition.

Blake (1983) lent support to this observation. In a study of 134 children, ages four to twelve, in Mexico City, Blake found that systematic subjunctive usage did not begin to appear until about the age of 5, in the contexts of the adverbial cuando and in indirect command forms, i.e. volitionals. He found that in the semantic contexts of doubt and attitude, in subordinate clauses following such matrices as ser posible, tener miedo, no tener miedo, dudar, child speech did not begin to reflect adult patterns of usage until about the age of 10 (30). He also found high rates of error (as determined by frequency of subjunctive vs. indicative in adult usage) for children under age ten in predicates of attitude (ser lastima, gustar, no dar coraje, alegarse, no alegarse) and predicates of assertion (ser claro, ser oboio, ser seguro, creer). Thus, Blake concluded that subjunctive is last acquired in these contexts. Additionally, he found that the usage exhibited by adult speakers of Mexico City Spanish (of the same upper middle socioeconomic class) was highly variable (subjunctive/indicative) in these same contexts of doubt and attitude.

Gutiérrez (1994) attested the same high variability of subjunctive usage among three generations of 25 adult monolingual Spanish speakers in Michoacán, Mexico. His data demonstrated that a significant percentage of younger speakers deviated from academically prescribed norms for subjunctive usage in Spanish, in some cases opting for indicative forms instead. He found that the subjunctive forms were absent in 11% of variable contexts for usage among the first generation (age 51 and over) in Michoacán, compared with 24% for the
second generation (age 30-50) and 23% for the third generation (age 29 and under). Gutiérrez stated that the decline of subjunctive usage among generation two and generation three speakers indicates "a possible loss of the subjunctive mood in younger speakers" in Michoacán (117), attesting the highly variable and constantly decreasing usage of the subjunctive even in some non-contact varieties of Spanish.

2.2 The subjunctive in Spanish second language acquisition. The findings presented in studies of L2 acquisition of Spanish subjunctive by L1 English adult learners reveal similar patterns and rates of acquisition as for L1 learners. The contexts in which forms first begin to appear in more spontaneous spoken production are volitional querer que, purpose para que and adverbial cuando, as will be explained below. Accurate and appropriate use of the subjunctive in dubitative and emotive contexts generally does not appear until much later in the acquisition process, at quite advanced levels. In addition, all of the studies thus far have indicated that amount of formal classroom instruction and study has no significant effect on the frequency or accuracy of learners' usage of the subjunctive (Terrell, Baycroft & Perrone 1987, Stokes 1988, 1990, Collentine 1995, 1997, Pereira 1996).

Terrell, Baycroft, and Perrone (1987) studied a group of college-level learners completing first-year study of Spanish as a second language. The data were based on oral interviews completed with individual learners at the end of the course. A total of 70 students were recorded. Of the total recordings, only 81 possible contexts for the
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subjunctive appeared in the learners' speech. Of those 81 contexts, only 10 exhibited a morphologically accurate form of the subjunctive. Of those 10 which were accurate, only 8 were found to be comprehensible by native Spanish speakers.

Terrell et al. (1987) noted that in comprehensibility ratings of the learners' speech by native speakers, no verb form (out of the 81 contexts identified) was misinterpreted by more than 30% of the raters, i.e. the majority of the raters almost always understood the message being conveyed by learners despite errors of mood distinction. In the cases where misinterpretation did occur, Terrell et al. explained that syntactic error was the greater culprit. The following example was given (26):

"Nos quiere ir al laboratorio usted?"

Intended learner message: Do you want us to go to the lab?

Native speaker interpretation: Do you want to take us to the lab? OR

Do you want to go with us to the lab?

Accurate form: ¿Quiere usted que vayamos al laboratorio?

Additionally, Terrell et al. (1987) found that a large percentage of contexts requiring the subjunctive in learner speech (which yielded

---

2 Terrell et al. (1987) explained that this extremely low percentage of contexts for subjunctive in spoken Spanish is also characteristic of native speaker varieties. He cited a study by Bull (1947) which analyzed the appearance of the subjunctive across a variety of written texts in Spanish. Bull found that all forms of the subjunctive combined constituted only 5% of all verb forms used in the various sources analyzed. Terrell et al. (1987) stated that spoken Spanish most likely exhibits the same tendencies.
inaccuracies when they used the indicative) comprised volition, in most cases, querer que.... Another substantial percentage comprised adverbial clauses with cuando. As such, Terrell et al. maintained that if classroom instruction were focused exclusively on subjunctive usage in these two contexts, overall speech accuracy with regard to mood distinction at that stage of acquisition would greatly increase. Additionally, since errors of word order (as in the above example) constituted a substantial portion of the learner utterances which were misunderstood by native speakers, the authors proposed that learners could benefit by an approach which gives primordiality to developing syntactic ability before subjunctive morphological ability.

A similar suggestion was made by Collentine (1995). He maintained that the reason that learners do not acquire the subjunctive until late stages is because they lack the necessary complex syntax structure (matrix followed by subordinate clause) which almost always characterizes the appearance of the subjunctive form. Collentine's (1995) cognitive experiment showed that learners were not able to generate subjunctive forms because they lacked necessary syntactic abilities to create complex sentences, i.e. subordinate clauses.

Quesada (1995), however, refuted Collentine's (1995) claim. In her data of a group of sixteen adult intermediate-level study abroad learners in Querétaro, Mexico, she attested "abundant" complex sentence structures in which indicative forms appeared in the subordinate clause. She found that in informal written data (taken from journals) and oral data (informal interviews), the learners still did not produce the subjunctive in dubitative contexts at the end of an intensive three-month experience abroad. She stated that "...there was no subjunctive use following the syntactic frames expressing doubt..." (201). Quesada (1995) explained that:
The complement verbs following this syntactic frame (doubt) can take either the indicative or the subjunctive mood based on the point of view or the intentions of the speaker. Faced with making this subtle pragmatic distinction in their speech, it is possible that these learners, incapable of doing so, opt for using the indicative mood, their default verbal form when unable to make decisions—or unaware of their prerogative to do so. (201)

What is indeed interesting is that while Terrell et al.'s (1987) study found little or no usage of the subjunctive forms in beginning-level learner production, both Collentine's (1997) and Quesada's (1995) studies demonstrated that intermediate-level learners begin to use these forms quite systematically in the contexts of volition querer que...³ Additionally, they both observed that the learners in their respective studies demonstrated little or no usage of the subjunctive in dubitative dudar que... or emotive alegrarse que... contexts.⁴

Based on these studies, it can be maintained that the subjunctive constitutes a feature of speech which is acquired quite late by both L1 and L2 learners. One could propose, as have all of the above researchers in one way or another, that several factors conspire to inhibit and retard the acquisition of the subjunctive forms (mood distinction) in Spanish by L1 children and L2 adults alike:

³ Following Givón's event integration scale, Collentine (1997) called this context "manipulation," but it implicates the same semantic and syntactic 'quiere que...' structure as the "volitional," in other terms.
⁴ Following Givón's event integration scale, Collentine (1997) called these contexts "epistemic uncertainty" and "epistemic anxiety," respectively. "Epistemic uncertainty" implies doubt, so it is "dubitativo," in other terms, and "epistemic anxiety" is exemplified by the structure "siento que..." Although "anxiety" would not so accurately describe "alegrarse que..." in psychological terms, in semantic terms it would fall into the same category as "alegrarse que..." in that both can be considered "emotive."
(1) The subjunctive is a low frequency form in both spoken and written modes of Spanish. As Bull (1947) and Terrell et al. (1987) have observed, subjunctive forms (past, present, and perfect forms all combined) comprise about 5% of written and spoken discourse.

(2) In most of the contexts where it does occur, the subjunctive form is semantically redundant. It is almost always preceded by (and perhaps also followed by) a lexical item(s) which reveal(s) the semantic notion that is redundantly grammaticalized in the Spanish subjunctive morphology, e.g. quiero que, dudo que, prefiero que, me alegro de que, no creo que, es imposible que, etc. Thus, as Collentine (1997) and Lee (1987) have pointed out, the morphology often goes undetected, or "unnoticed."

(3) Present tense subjunctive and indicative morphological forms for regular verbs constitute phonological minimal pairs, e.g. cante/canta (cantar), coma/come (comer), escriba/escribe (escribir), as do the regular '-ar' verb forms in the past tense, e.g. trabajara/trabajaba (trabajar), such that their distinction may be easily confused or assumed to be semantically unimportant. Zentella (1997) has highlighted this subjunctive/indicative minimal pair "confusion" in the speech of New York Puerto Rican bilinguals whose speech reflects incomplete acquisition or language attrition.

(4) As pointed out by Terrell et al. (1987), misuse or lack of use of the subjunctive in Spanish very rarely leads to misinterpretation or incomprehension on the part of interlocutors.

(5) At the pragmatic level, subjunctive usage often entails abstract notions which are differentiated by very fine shades of meaning, e.g. to establish something as being asserted or nonasserted in argumentative style (Lavandera 1983), to establish something as relevant or minimally relevant to the main proposition within the
discourse context (Lunn 1989), and/or known or unknown to the hearer (Guitart 1982, Lunn 1989).

2.3 The subjunctive in the Spanish of U.S. Spanish-English bilinguals.
Merino's (1976, 1983) research was the first which longitudinally documented the attrition of subjunctive verb forms among Spanish-English bilinguals in the U.S. Her investigation (1976) was initially focused on the acquisition of syntax of Chicano children in grades K-4 of a San Francisco bilingual program, but ultimately her data revealed attrition of subjunctive forms rather than development across grades. When the children entered kindergarten, they were identified as balanced bilinguals, i.e. they were equally proficient in Spanish and in English, as determined by parent, teacher, and student interviews and questionnaires on language use and ability. Of 41 subjects, 9 were in kindergarten, 4 were first-graders, 9 second-graders, 10 third-graders, and 9 fourth-graders.

For the study, Merino (1976) employed a delayed imitation task to elicit children's utterances based on pictures. For each task, the child was shown two pictures which reflected a grammatical contrast as a description of each picture was heard. Subsequently, the experimenter would ask the child to repeat what had been said about a particular picture as the experimenter pointed to it. Merino found that 1) the children's participation in the bilingual program had no significant effect on their comprehension and production skills in Spanish or in English, and 2) performance in English improved significantly across grades K-4, but in Spanish, performance dropped sharply for the fourth graders. With respect to subjunctive usage, Merino (1976) stated that the fourth graders performed at a level close to the kindergarteners, and with respect to the conditional forms, fourth graders' performance
felled to the level of second graders. The differences were statistically significant.

In the report (Merino 1983) of a follow-up study carried out two years later, the investigator repeated her assessment instrument and language use questionnaire with 32 of the same children from her original study (Merino 1976). All but four of the 32 students had been enrolled in a bilingual program up to grade four. Merino found that, for the sample as a whole, performance in English production continued to improve, but Spanish productive skills deteriorated significantly. With respect to Spanish production, 50% of the children reflected attrition and 25% demonstrated no gains whatsoever (286). Accuracy in the Spanish subjunctive forms fell from 70% in the first investigation to 55% in the follow-up study two years later.

Merino (1983) stated that the differences in Spanish performance between the two administrations were significant for the categories of past tense, relative constructions, and subjunctive forms, while the conditional only evidenced a lack of longitudinal development. She explained that:

In the Spanish subjunctive, changes in performance from one administration to the next were largely due to the items testing control of the dubitative, *tal vez* construction.... In the purposive construction, children who had previously produced *El señor saca un libro para que lea* (The man takes out a book for him to read), at the second administration said, *El señor saca un libro para que leer.* (291)

According to Merino (1983), loss of the subjunctive forms and lack of syntactic relativization support the hypothesis that features which are acquired later are lost first among English-dominant
bilingual children in the U.S. context (288). However, this hypothesis is not supported by Merino's data with regard to past tense usage, since it is a grammatical feature which is generally acquired quite early by Spanish-speaking children.

Zentella's (1997) longitudinal study of five bilingual Puerto Ricans in New York City indicated that only two speakers regularly employed the present, past, and pluperfect subjunctive forms; the other three evidenced variation of these forms with the indicative in some syntactic contexts (194). Zentella explained that irregular use of these forms may be attributable to two principal linguistic factors: 1) use in Island Puerto Rican Spanish of imperfect indicative and imperfect subjunctive in contexts prescriptively requiring the conditional perfect and pluperfect subjunctive, and 2) the influence of minimal pairs constituting the present indicative and subjunctive forms and the imperfect indicative and subjunctive forms (190-194). She observed that 'quiere que' in the matrix clause "triggers the present subjunctive for everyone but 'duda que' does not" (194).

Zentella's findings with regard to dubitative contexts, i.e. *dudar que, no creer que*, reflect the patterns of subjunctive/indicative usage observed in studies carried out in Los Angeles (Ocampo 1990, Silva-Corvalán 1994a), Texas (Marrocco 1972, Sánchez 1972, Solé 1977), and the Southwest (Floyd 1978, Lozano 1974, 1975, Ross 1975). All of these studies suggest that in the variable context of dubitative expression, which allows the use of either the indicative or the subjunctive, the indicative is the preferred form of second and third generation U.S. Spanish speakers.

Dubitative constructions were among the variable contexts highlighted by Ocampo (1990) and Silva-Corvalán (1994a) in studies of the Spanish of successive generations of Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles. Ocampo (1990) demonstrated the importance of identifying
distinct lexico-syntactic and semantic contexts in order to observe the phenomenon of simplification and loss of the subjunctive mood. Silva-Corvalán (1994a) identified eighteen such contexts (264-265). The fourteen most commonly occurring ones are reflected in Figure 1. The remaining four—hypothetical manner (como si...), impossibility, causative and adverbials of manner/time/place—occurred fewer than 30 times in the total sample which she analyzed.

**Figure 1**

**Most frequent syntactic and semantic contexts for occurrence of the Spanish subjunctive, as identified by Silva-Corvalán (1994a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Example with subjunctive form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volitional</td>
<td>quiero que hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose clause</td>
<td>para que hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessive clause</td>
<td>aunque hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>lamento que hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal (main clause)</td>
<td>debiera hablar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental act</td>
<td>no advierte que hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal clause</td>
<td>cuando hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apodosis</td>
<td>... le hablara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protasis</td>
<td>si viniera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>no sé si hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal clause</td>
<td>así como hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative clause</td>
<td>donde hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectival clause</td>
<td>el que hable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>sé que hable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the eighteen categories included in her analysis, Silva-Corvalán (1994a) identified the following as categorical, or obligatory contexts for the indicative in Spanish: nominal clauses with affirmative assertive matrices, and apodosis of protasis (260-261). Categorical contexts for the subjunctive were: nominal clauses with volitional and causative matrices and matrices expressing
impossibility, hypothetical manner clauses, temporal clauses expressing futurity, purpose clauses, and "a number of comment matrices that always co-occurred with subjunctive in Group 1 (e.g. es mejor que..., está bien que" (261). The remainder of the contexts were identified as variable contexts, allowing either subjunctive or indicative forms according to semantic and pragmatic factors.\(^5\)

Silva-Corvalán's (1994a) findings indicated that, in terms of frequency, the subjunctive was lost to a significant degree in linguistic contexts identified as variable; categorical contexts were less permeable to simplification and loss: "In lexico-syntactic contexts that require subjunctive, this mood decreases from 93.8% in Group 1, to 74.2% in Group 2, and to 52.5% in Group 3... In contexts where the choice is possible, the subjunctive falls from 30.9% to 23.5% to 12.4% across the three groups" (266). These results corroborated Ocampo's (1990) conclusion that the subjunctive usage of third-generation Mexican-origin speakers in Los Angeles is lost in variable contexts and greatly reduced in categorical contexts.\(^6\) Ocampo interpreted his results in the following way:

... se observa que la situación de lenguas en contacto inicia un proceso que comienza con la disminución del subjuntivo en los contextos en los que es posible la variación, con la consiguiente pérdida de los matices semánticos, seguido de la eliminación de las restricciones formales y, por último, de la desaparición total de este modo. (45)

\(^5\) Smead (1988) presents a detailed analysis of the variable usage of subjunctive by adult Mexican-American Spanish speakers in the context of evaluatives with respect to the semantic characteristic [-factive]. The results of his study indicated that for evaluative complements characterized as [-factive] there was a tendency for occurrence of the subjunctive in this variable context. A more concise discussion of mood selection in evaluative complements is offered in Smead 1994.

\(^6\) The contexts included in Ocampo's (1990) analysis were: comentario, acto mental, volitivas, incertidumbre, imposibilidad, relativas, temporales, finales, condicionales, concesivas, causales negadas, locativas, modales, causativas.
Torres' (1997) cross-generational study of Puerto Ricans in Brentwood, New York presented evidence from oral narratives that subjunctive forms were not simplified by successive generations in that community, lending support to the previous findings of Pousada and Poplack (1982) for Puerto Ricans in New York City. However, to my knowledge, these are the only two studies which do not reveal evidence of some degree of reduction and/or simplification of the subjunctive mood among successive generations of Spanish speakers in the U.S.

As I am presently aware, there are no existing studies in published form which treat the situation of the Spanish verb system of bilinguals in the Miami context, despite the wide range of research inquiries into other varieties of Spanish spoken by U.S. Hispanic bilinguals, some of which I have reviewed in the previous pages. Since the social, demographic, political, and economic situation of Spanish in the Miami context is vastly distinct from that of other U.S. contexts (a suggestion which is carefully developed in Chapter Three, following), it is quite possible that the linguistic processes at play and the possible extent of mood variability and/or simplification in the Spanish of Miami Cuban bilinguals are quite different as well. This suggestion motivated the basic research questions which served to guide the present investigation. These questions are stated in section three.
3. Research questions.

The following questions will be addressed in this analysis:

1. How does usage of the subjunctive in distinct linguistic contexts compare across three generations of Spanish speakers living in a bilingual context such as Miami?
2. In categorical and variable contexts where the subjunctive does not appear, what verb forms replace it?
3. How might the use of a different verb form semantically and pragmatically affect the meaning of the utterance?

Each of these questions is quantitatively and qualitatively considered in Chapter Five. The sociolinguistic implications of the findings relevant to language contact, language variability, and cross-generational maintenance of Spanish in the bilingual context of Miami are considered in Chapter Six.

Summary and conclusions

Usage of the subjunctive in modern varieties of Spanish is highly variable. In the present chapter, this phenomenon was explained through the synthesis of findings presented in research on Spanish in the U.S. and acquisition of Spanish as a first and second language.

On the theoretical plane, the difficulties of characterizing the factors which condition subjunctive usage were highlighted. Purely syntactic explanations are not adequate, since a number of Spanish matrix clauses may appropriately be followed by either the subjunctive or the indicative. In these cases, semantic and pragmatic-level factors seem more influential in determining speaker choice.
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Within the realm of empirical research, the problematic theoretical conceptualization of subjunctive usage is evidenced in actual speech. For both first and second language learners of Spanish, variable contexts of subjunctive usage, such as those presented by the dubitative and emotive, are late acquired. It is in these late-acquired, highly variable contexts where we readily find the most significant degree of simplification and preferred indicative usage among Spanish-English bilinguals in the U.S. context.

The late acquisition and high variability of the subjunctive forms in non-contact varieties of Spanish would suggest that in the contact varieties of Spanish used by U.S. bilinguals, variation and simplification would be more apparent still. This assumption underlies the motivation of the study presented in the remaining pages of this dissertation, focused on the Spanish of three generations of Cuban Spanish speakers in Miami.
Chapter Three

Spanish-speaking Miami in sociolinguistic perspective

"Unwittingly, Miami has become the nation's first full-fledged experiment in bicultural living in the contemporary era. Other U.S. cities, such as New York and Los Angeles, also have large Spanish-speaking and immigrant populations, but nowhere has the social and economic weight of the newcomers or their political significance been greater than in South Florida...." (Portes & Stepick 1993, xii)

Introduction

Miami is the only major metropolitan area in the world, and most certainly so in the United States, where one could argue that Spanish and English compete for social, economic, and political dominance. The city has been transformed from an overgrown touristic center controlled by Anglos and Jews in the 1950s to the bastion of Cuban exile in the 1960s and 1970s. The 1980s marked widescale Hispanic immigration from regions beyond Cuba encompassing numerous other Latin American national backgrounds. In the decade of the 1990s, Miami has established itself as the capital of Latin American trade and commerce, entertainment, television, pop culture and U.S. Hispanic power (Américas 1992, Booth 1993, Olson & Olson 1995, MacSwan 1996).

In their 1993 book entitled City on the Edge, sociologists Alejandro Portes and Alex Stepick described Miami as follows:

The city is several things at once: at the southern end of the land and astride two cultural worlds; about to complete its first
century of existence; and, above all, on the edge of a future marked by uncertainty, but also by the promise of pathbreaking innovations in urban life. The multilingual, multicultural experiment that is Miami holds important lessons for what the American city will be about in a changed world. (xiv)

Approaching the year 2000, Miami’s sociolinguistic situation remains greatly understudied (Resnick 1988, Roca 1991) and, making exception for anecdote, widely uncommented. Perhaps such has been the case of Miami because of its somewhat confusing sociolinguistic character. Within this singular metropolitan area, there is ample evidence, anecdotal as much as empirical, of stable bilingualism and stable monolingualism, language maintenance and language loss, acculturation, biculturalism and cultural resistance. The Spanish-speaking majority, which is the general majority in Miami, is neither politically nor socially oppressed, and the Spanish language is neither principally associated with the working class nor with economic poverty.¹ English is not the sole language of financial wealth and economic success. Rather, economic and professional success in Miami is more commonly equated with English-Spanish bilingualism in the decade of the 1990’s (cf. Fradd 1996, Boswell 1999), and a wide sector of Miami’s prominent politicians, businesspeople and entrepreneurs are Spanish-speakers who principally use Spanish in their professional and commercial establishments. At all levels, the demand of Miami’s general marketplace is bilingual.

The purpose of the present chapter is to place Miami’s bilingual situation in sociolinguistic perspective upon the eve of the new

¹ A September 10, 1998 Miami Herald article highlighted the efforts made by many Miami English-speakers to learn and use Spanish because of the instrumental need for it in gaining employment and seeking professional and social opportunities (Santiago).
millennium, exactly forty years after the "Cubanization" of Miami (Boswell 1994) was begun. In the first section of this chapter, I will synthesize the findings of a number of relevant sociological and geographical studies carried out in Miami in the past decade in order to establish that the emergence of the metropolitan area has been characterized by massive Hispanic immigration and the growing societal importance of the Spanish language. In the second section, I will turn to the consideration of bilingualism in the context of Miami, and offer explanations of key theoretical concepts of individual and societal bilingualism, to the end that Miami is indeed a bilingual metropolitan area perhaps inappropriately categorized under the traditional rubric of bilingualism in relation to diglossia. In the third section, I will argue that, based on the past and present situation of Spanish language in the Miami context, the most sensible prediction for the future is one which takes into account the high likelihood of continued Spanish maintenance at both the generational and societal levels.

1. Back to the future: The formation of Hispanic Miami

Miami-Dade's Anglo population shrank from 608,000 in the 1960 census to 414,000 in 1990, while the Hispanic population increased by 903,000 in the same 30-year time period. Although the Jewish population increased between the 1960 and 1980 census counts, it too reflected decrease in the decade of the 1980's, dropping by some 69,000 in number. The Black population is the only ethnic group in Miami which reflects steady and proportionate growth in composition (Boswell 1994: 10). Boswell (1994) has described the transformation of Miami as a "Cubanization" phase from 1960 through the middle 1970s, followed in the 1980s and continuing into the present decade by a
"Hispanicization" phase created by the mass arrival of Nicaraguans, Colombians, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Mexicans, Hondurans, Peruvians, Salvadorans, and other nationalities who have also arrived in thousands. With the exception of the Nicaraguans, Miami's non-Cuban Hispanics have arrived gradually since the middle 1970s. The following two subsections of this chapter will describe the immigration and settlement of Miami's two most numerous Hispanic nationalities whose arrival en masse marked rapid alteration of the city's social and demographic profile: the Cubans and the Nicaraguans.

1.1 The establishment of Cuban Miami. The "Cubanization" of Miami (Boswell 1994) was a relatively rapid social process. Prior to the 1950s, the areas of highest concentration of Cubans in Florida were in the cities of Key West and Tampa, while New York City comprised the largest Cuban population in the United States. In Dade County, approximately 20,000 Hispanics were documented by the 1950 U.S. Census (Boswell & Curtis 1983: 72), and it is estimated that some five to six thousand Cubans resided in the city of Miami on the eve of Castro's government takeover in Cuba in 1958. At that time, the Cubans' relationship with Miami was principally characterized by trade and tourism. With daily flights between Miami and La Havana run by several airlines, Miami was a highly popular vacation destination for middle and upper-class Cubans who visited the city in great number throughout the decade of the 1950s for purposes of shopping and recreation. Although their experience in Miami had been very much of a touristic and commercial nature, many Cubans who emigrated there upon Castro's takeover were already familiar with the city and the quality of life which it had to offer. Portes and Stepick (1993) described this phenomenon:
When the Cuban middle class did start to exit the island, it went to a social environment made utterly familiar by years of proper travel. No culture shock here. Unlike later refugees from other communist regimes..., Cuba’s exiles did not really move to a foreign land. Southern Florida was known territory. This perceptual frame allowed early escapees from the revolution—members of the old elite who came to await the “inevitable” downfall of Castro—to define their sojourn to South Florida simply as an extended vacation. (101)

By the 1960 U.S. Census, Dade County had experienced a 250% increase in its Hispanic population, registering an estimated 50,000 residents of Spanish-speaking background. In that year, 81% of the county’s residents were considered non-Hispanic White, 15% Black, and 4% Hispanic. This 250% increase in Dade’s Hispanic population was owed to the initial stage of the first wave of Cuban immigration into Miami. Resnick (1988) explained that the first wave of immigrants was “ideologically and racially compatible with America by virtue of their near-universal work ethic, their flight from the oppression of communism, and their light skins” (96). What is more, many of these immigrants represented pre-Castro Cuba’s political and professional elite, officially welcomed into the United States as political exiles. Many were highly educated entrepreneurs who established businesses which provided a network of employment opportunities for Cubans and kept capital within Spanish-speaking social networks. Resnick maintained that:

Like no other immigrant group in the history of the United States, the Cuban community had the necessary mass, know-how, economic power, legal status, and cooperation of the host
community to be able to demand that needed social and governmental services be provided for them in Spanish. In doing so, they established a legitimacy of Spanish language use that was to have a lasting impact on South Florida. (1988: 96)

By the 1970 census count, 299,217 Hispanics lived in Dade County, constituting 23.6% of the county’s total population of 1,267,792 in that year. The great majority were of Cuban origin. Boswell and Curtis (1983) stated: “Whereas prior to the 1960s Cubans had probably constituted less than 50 percent of the county’s Latin population, by 1970 it had risen to over 85 percent. In 1966, for example, it was estimated that 13 out of every 15 Latins residing in Dade County were Cuban” (75).

The second major wave of immigrants, who came en masse via “Freedom Flights” between 1969 and 1973, was younger, less wealthy, and reflected lower educational backgrounds than the first wave, but they were readily accommodated by already-established Cuban social, economic and political networks. As skilled laborers, these newly arrived immigrants altered the socioeconomic profile of Cubans in Miami. Though only 7 to 10 % of Miami Cubans in the 1960s were service workers, more than 25% occupied service positions of the lower socioeconomic classes by the early 1970s (Olson & Olson 1995: 70-71). Resnick (1988) explained that this second wave of immigrants served to greatly reinforce the maintenance of Cuban Spanish in Miami, both at the societal and familial levels.

By the year 1980, residents of Spanish-speaking origin in Dade County numbered 581,030. In that year, 35.7% of Dade County’s total population of 1,625,781 was considered Hispanic, the great majority Cuban, with demographic concentrations in the areas of Southwest
Eighth Street just by Downtown Miami, better known as "Little Havana," and in Hialeah and Miami Beach. A total of 124,779 Cubans arrived in the U.S. seeking political asylum between April and October of 1980 (Olson & Olson 1995: 81). This third major wave of immigrants, known as the "Marielitos," met the greatest political, social and economic resistance of any of the prior groups of Cubans arriving in Miami.

As a result of what has been termed the "blue jeans revolution" of 1979-1980, and a crippling economic recession coupled with political dissent in Cuba in the late 1970s, tens of thousands of Cubans flooded the Peruvian Embassy in Havana when Castro opened it to those wishing to emigrate. In turn, there was large-scale emigration to Peru and Costa Rica in early April of 1980, and on April 21, 1980, Castro opened the port of Mariel to anyone desiring exit to the United States. Seventy percent of the Cubans who arrived in the U.S. from Mariel were males, most of them single, and many of African descent. More importantly, some 26,000 had prison records in Cuba, but only 4 to 6% of that number were believed to be "hard-core" criminals. Most had been jailed for political reasons such as for being capitalists, or for minor crimes like trading on the black market. Others were gay or lesbian, unaccepted by the social ideologies imposed by Castro's regime. Still others were convicted of prostitution, and a small minority were institutionalized mental patients (Boswell & Curtis 1983: 53).

Although in their vast majority the Marielitos were socioeconomically and educationally quite similar to the previous waves of Cuban immigrants in the 1970s (Portes, Stepick & Clark 1985), a panicked reaction by the greater Miami community characterized their arrival because of the greatly publicized criminal element composing their extreme minority. As such, their entrance into the
workplace and their acceptance into wider social networks proved a much more laborious and painstaking process than had been the case of the previous wave. By late 1983, nearly one in four Mariel immigrants was unemployed. Of those employed, monthly median household (combined) incomes were substantially lower than those of previous immigrants in the sixties and seventies, and nearly $500 less than for the U.S. Cuban population as a whole (Portes, Stepick & Clark 1985: 6).

In addition to a lack of social networks, including family, and the problem of high unemployment and below average incomes, Mariel Cubans faced a distinct challenge which previous immigrant groups had not met—discrimination by their co-nationals already established in Miami. After three years in the U.S., 75% of Marielitos indicated that they had been clearly discriminated against by "older" pre-1980 Miami Cubans; 21% reported frequent experiences of anti-Mariel discrimination in the Miami Cuban community (Portes, Stepick & Clark 1985: 8). For the substantial number of Black Cubans arriving with the Mariel wave, racism represented yet another dimension of the discrimination faced by these immigrants.

Although it would appear that the Marielitos reflected a slower adaptation and acquisition process in English language learning than did most previous (pre-1980) Cuban immigrants in Miami, this supposition is not clearly borne out if one considers the vast numbers of older Cubans who arrived in the sixties and who, more than thirty years later, still have very little to minimal knowledge of English and who hardly use English, if at all, in their everyday lives. However, Portes, Stepick and Clark (1985) reported that 57% of 1980 Cuban immigrant respondents in their survey spoke no English after three years in the U.S., according to them, a figure 13 points higher than for
either 1973 Cuban immigrants or for Haitian immigrants who also arrived in 1980 (4). Widescale linguistic assessment studies would be necessary to accurately determine the degree of English proficiency and bilingualism among Mariel Cuban immigrants in Miami today, nearly twenty years later, but it is probably safe to assume that the majority of them now possess some basic degree of English proficiency and that their daily lives reflect the bilingual reality of Miami, particularly for those who arrived as pre-adolescents.

By the early 1980s, Cubans no longer represented the principal immigrant group arriving in Miami. Their numbers were surpassed by other Latin American groups, principally the Nicaraguans.

1.2 The Nicaraguan exodus to Miami. With the arrival of thousands of Nicaraguans fleeing political strife in their homeland throughout the eighties, Miami could no longer characterize itself as a “Cuban” city. Throughout the decade of the 1980s and into the 1990s, the use of the term “Hispanic” in the context of Miami came to the sociological forefront (Boswell 1994). As with the Cubans, Nicaraguan immigration occurred in three major waves. The first wave of nearly 15,000 Nicaraguans, overwhelmingly comprised of the upper socioeconomic class and including the Somoza family itself, arrived in Miami in the years immediately following the overthrow of the right-wing Somoza regime by the Sandinistas in 1979. Most of the immigrants, tied to the pursestrings of the Somoza government, were political dissidents and entrepreneurial elites who brought with them much wealth. It is estimated that since 1981, some 30% of Nicaragua’s professional class has emigrated from their homeland (Gugliotta 1989: 16A). A great number of them established lavish residences on Key Biscayne and in the Brickell and Kendall areas of Dade County in the early eighties.
Nicaragua saw continued conflict and unabated political violence throughout the 1980s as the Reagan administration supported the Contra war and the Sandinista government trembled amidst the widespread battle. Exposed to dangerous conditions in their homeland, great numbers of Nicaraguans continued to migrate to the United States. As the first wave of immigration abated in the early eighties, members of the middle class began to arrive in Miami, settling primarily in the western suburb of Sweetwater in an area which later came to be known as “Little Managua.” Many established social networks and found economic and employment opportunities among the Cubans who were already present and the recently arrived Nicaraguan entrepreneurial elite (Portes & Stepick 1993: 153).

The third wave of Nicaraguan immigration into Miami took shape in the mid-1980s and peaked in 1989. Between summer 1988 and early 1989, an estimated 300 Nicaraguan refugees were settling in Dade County every week, according to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (Portes & Stepick 1993: 150). Special continuous Greyhound bus service was established between the Texas-Mexico border and South Florida in January 1989, with as many as ten buses of refugees arriving daily in Miami-Dade County. By the end of this third major wave of immigration, comprised almost entirely of the lower socioeconomic classes with little educational formation, the number of Nicaraguans in Miami was modestly estimated at 100,000, with some estimates as high as 175,000 (Boswell & Curtis 1991: 148). The official 1990 U.S. Census count registered 74,000 Nicaraguans living in Miami, only 14% of whom were U.S. citizens.

Although Nicaraguans clearly represent Miami’s second largest Hispanic national group, unlike the Cubans they were unable to create a Miami Nicaraguan social discourse and gain a cohesive presence in
the political and economic arenas of Miami-Dade. What many had thought was to be a Nicaraguan "repeat performance" of the Cuban settlement did not occur. Portes and Stepick explained that:

All the signs pointed to a repeat performance of the Cuban experience and the eventual emergence of a strong Nicaraguan-American voice in local affairs. This did not happen, however, for other forces conspired against this plausible outcome. First, the Nicaraguan exodus occurred over a far more compressed period of time than the Cuban.... [T]he Nicaraguan inflow took less than ten years, with the first working-class waves arriving barely five years after the original elites.... Second, the hostility of the federal government toward permanent resettlement of Nicaraguans in the Untied States weakened the group's voice in local affairs.... The Nicaraguans were just too busy trying to fend off the INS to develop a coherent local profile. Third, the Nicaraguan exodus lacked finality.... Nicaraguan refugees never had the door firmly and permanently closed behind them.... A mythical Nicaragua could not be constructed in exile, as the Cubans had done with their island, because the real Nicaragua was too accessible. (1993: 169-70)

1.3 The Hispanic presence in modern-day Miami. In the decade of the 1990s, Nicaraguan immigration has waned greatly, and the influx of Cubans has been reduced to the more isolated arrival of "balseros" who cross the Florida Strait from the Island on makeshift rafts. Spanish-speaking immigrants of widely diverse origins have continued to arrive in Miami, however. The 1990 census reflected that Miami's Hispanic population increased from 36% to 49% between 1980 and 1990,
while the percentage of Cubans decreased from 70% to 59% (Boswell 1994).

The twelve largest Hispanic nationality groups inhabiting Miami-Dade in 1990 were, in descending order of their number by official Census count: Cubans (564,000), Nicaraguans (74,000), Puerto Ricans (69,000), Colombians (54,000), Dominicans (23,000), Mexicans (23,000), Hondurans (18,000), Peruvians (16,000), Guatemalans (8,000), Ecuadorians (8,000), Salvadorans (7,000), Panamanians (7,000) (Boswell 1994: 16). All other Hispanic nationalities constituted 80,000 people. In 1990, of Miami-Dade’s total population, 45% were foreign-born, the highest percentage for any metropolitan area in the nation. Miami-Dade is preceded only by Los Angeles County for the absolute number of foreign-born population. The vast majority of Miami’s foreign-born residents are of Spanish-speaking origins (Boswell 1994). Of the Hispanics who have been in Miami the longest, the Cubans, only 30% were U.S.-born.

Approaching the eve of the new millennium and the next U.S. Census, present-day Miami-Dade’s social makeup, as well as its national and international image, is decidedly “Hispanic.” The 1990 census registered more than 953,000 Hispanics in a county whose total population numbered well under two million, making it 49.2% Hispanic. Several of the county’s major municipalities constituted a majority Hispanic population, among them, Miami (city proper, 62.5%), Miami Beach (57.6%), Sweetwater (93.0%), West Miami (79.4%), Virginia Gardens (50.6%), Medley (58.1%), Islandia (76.9%), Hialeah (87.6%), and Hialeah Gardens (82.0%). In two other municipalities, Coral Gables and Miami Springs, Hispanics represented nearly half of the population, both at 41.8%, and the total population of unincorporated Dade County was 41% Hispanic (Boswell 1994).
Based on immigration trends and migration patterns throughout the past 9 years, it is estimated that the Hispanic population has increased in Miami-Dade as the non-Hispanic White population has continued to diminish. Geographers estimate that the principal decrease in non-Hispanic White residents occurred in 1992 in the wake of Hurricane Andrew, which left near total destruction in its path through southern Dade County and the suburbs south of the city of Miami, the principal areas of remaining Anglo residence (Boswell, personal communication, 1998). Following the hurricane, many refused to rebuild their homes and left the area for traditionally more "American" and predominantly Anglo Broward County to the north, as had done the majority of other Anglo residents of Miami-Dade in the previous three decades (Boswell 1994). The only group besides Hispanics which experienced growth since 1960 were Blacks. However, by 1990, they still only represented 21% of Miami-Dade’s total population, and were residentially heavily segregated from both Anglos and non-Black Hispanics (Boswell 1993).

Geographical predictions for the future are for an even greater Hispanic presence in Miami-Dade. Immigration from the Spanish-speaking world will most likely remain steady well into the future, as Anglos and Jews continue their flight to the north. Boswell (1994) maintained:

Although changes in U.S. Immigration policy may play a decisive role in the future of migration flows from Latin American countries to South Florida, all indications are that current trends will continue into the foreseeable future. White flight from Dade County on the part of Anglos and Jews will likely continue. The number of Cubans and non-Cuban
Hispanics will increase and Dade County will probably become even more Hispanic than it is now. (41)

2. Miami: Bilingual city?
The social and demographic profile of Miami-Dade in 1999 suggests that the presence of the Spanish language has become even more palpable in the past decade. For mainstream America, Miami has become synonymous with Spanish, and the majority of Miamians themselves would probably answer affirmatively if asked if their city is bilingual. But what does 'bilingual' mean? We must establish that the term 'bilingual' may refer to an individual, to an isolated or integrated speech community, to a society, or to a nation as a whole. If we are to maintain that Miami is a bilingual city, we must first understand in more precise terms what is meant by 'bilingual' and to which individuals or groups we are referring within the social context of Miami. The subsections under 2.1 will briefly elucidate theoretical conceptualizations of bilingualism at the individual, societal, and generational levels. In 2.2, I will attempt to render these theoretical concepts applicable to the reality of present-day Spanish-speaking Miami, establishing that the city is appropriately labeled as bilingual.

2.1.1 Theoretical perspectives on individual level bilingualism.
Weinreich (1968) conceived of 'bilingualism' as "the practice of alternately using two languages..., and the persons involved" as 'bilingual' (1). He suggested that the bilingual individual may interpret semantic signs in one of three ways: coordinatively, compoudly, or subordinatively (Weinreich 1968: 9-10). To the coordinate bilingual, separate signifiers are used in reference to separate signifieds in each respective language. In this way, the two languages are learned
separately, and are stored and accessed separately. In the case of the compound bilingual, two signifiers are identified with a single signified, such that lexemes from two different languages are fused onto one singular mental representation. Compound bilingualism takes shape when the individual learns both languages simultaneously, and uses both in same environments. Subordinate bilinguals access a signifier in one subordinate, or secondary language via a signifier from another more dominant, or primary language. In this fashion, the subordinate language would be accessed through translation since, in essence, the signified for the subordinate language is the signifier from the dominant language, rather than the actual real-world object or referent (Weinreich 1968: 10).

These theoretical distinctions have motivated a great number of studies which both support and refute said concepts (cf. Romaine 1995: 80-84). What may be extrapolated from them is that the psycholinguistic processes underlying the storage, access and use of two separate linguistic systems is quite complex. Terms such as 'cognitive load' (Levelt 1979, Silva-Corvalán 1994b) and 'linguistic burden' (Weinreich 1968) make metaphorical reference to such complexity in the case of the bilingual. It would appear that cognitive strategies such as convergence, simplification, and overgeneralization which affect one or both of the relevant linguistic systems are owed to the difficulty of maintaining the systems separately. In this way, the influence of the two systems on each other seems inevitable at the level of individual bilingualism.

Cross-linguistic influence in the bilingual situation has been classified in a wide variety of ways. Among the most commonly used terms have been 'transfer', either 'positive' or 'negative', and 'interference'. Weinreich (1968) defined interference as "those
instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language” (1). The problem inherent in this definition is the identification of ‘deviations’ and ‘norms’ of languages within the realm of actual analysis. Since the majority of bilinguals live in and form part of greater bilingual communities, language ‘norms’ in most cases may reflect the variations of bilingual speech beyond the individual level, so that a ‘deviation’ may painstakingly if inappropriately be called such if it is manifested by a significant number of speakers in the community. Romaine (1995) affirms that “it is not possible to make a neat separation between bilingualism as a societal and individual phenomenon, particularly in the treatment of certain aspects of bilingual behavior, like borrowing and interference” (23).

Inherent in the debate around cross-linguistic influence and the degree of language maintenance or loss of a given language in a contact situation is the notion of proficiency. Silva-Corvalán (1994b) made reference to a ‘bilingual proficiency continuum’, explaining that individual bilinguals may be placed along a continuum according to their level of language skills. Those bilinguals at the higher end of the continuum demonstrate skills comparable to monolingual speakers of the same variety of the given language. The skills of those bilinguals at the lower end of the continuum reflect a great degree of interference from a competing linguistic system, evident in switching and phonological and grammatical imprecision. These individuals are usually perceived as ‘non-native’ or as dominant speakers of the competing language in such situations. In any case, the concept of proficiency remains incompletely defined and widely debated not only in the field of bilingualism and language contact but among second
language acquisition researchers as well, some of whom have challenged the classification of second language learners according to proficiency levels determined by tests and oral interviews (Lantolf 1988, Lantolf & Frawley 1992, Liskin-Gasparro 1984, Shohamy 1996).

'Proficiency' has traditionally been conceived of at the phonological and grammatical levels, with the judges' ear subjectively cast to the degree of 'fluency' of the speaker. Until recently, language researchers and educational testmakers directed little attention to the pragmatic and social levels of language skill, e.g. appropriate speech act realization, socially acceptable conversational structure, appropriate norms for turn-taking in conversation, and variation according to interlocutors and setting. Such skills fall under the rubric of 'communicative competence' as defined by Hymes (1972).

In the bilingual setting, code-switching is socially integrated into the communicative competence possessed and demonstrated by bilingual speakers (Gumperz 1982), i.e., switching between the two languages constitutes part of the bilingual's stylistic repertoire. In this event, code-switching is not evidence of necessary interference between the two linguistic systems, i.e. a 'deviation' from the norms of both languages, but rather a pragmatic and discourse norm demonstrated by the bilingual speech community itself. Thus, code-switching may signal linguistic deficit under the rubric of 'proficiency' and, at the same time, indicate a high level of sociolinguistic skill if viewed through the lens of 'communicative competence.' For this reason, the norms of a given linguistic variety Y are most appropriately determined from within the community Y, or the society of which community Y forms a part.

Additionally important to the linguistic repertoire of bilingual individuals are the attitudes toward the two languages which comprise
the speakers' social reality, and the domains, or contexts in which they use each language. Since both attitudes and domains of use are interrelated, and may be viewed as the product of the social, economic and political situation of the bilingual group in which the bilingual individual claims membership, we will consider that these factors in determining the extent of individual bilingualism are socially driven. Societal bilingualism is the focus of the next section.

2.1.2 Theoretical perspectives on bilingual societies. Ferguson’s (1959) original use of the term ‘diglossia’ was limited to societies in which two varieties (high ‘H’ and low ‘L’) of the same language are differentially used for distinct functions. The primary social situations exemplifying his theoretical concept of ‘diglossia’ were the use of Haitian Creole (L) and French (H) in Haiti, vernacular Arabic (L) and Classical Arabic (H) in Egypt, and Swiss German (L) and High German (H) in Switzerland. In these regions, H represents the language of education, government, religious ceremony, formal speeches and lectures, literary work and news reporting, while the use of L is reserved for familial interactions, informal conversation or for composing folk literature. By this dichotomy, H is considered the prestigious or standard variety, and L the colloquial variety. H is the language of the formal aspects of society, and L is the language of the home and informal interaction. For Ferguson, diglossia reflected a stable linguistic situation in which both varieties were maintained across many generations.

Fishman, Cooper and Ma (1971) identified five ‘domains’ for the use of Spanish and English among Puerto Rican bilinguals in New York City which included employment, education, religion, family, and friends. According to their sociological questionnaire data which posed to speakers hypothetical contexts for conversation, Spanish was
used mostly with family and friends, with differential degrees of preference for English in the domains of religion and employment. English was the principal language of the educational domain. Extending Ferguson’s (1959) original notion of diglossia to the context of the Puerto Rican community (‘el Barrio’) in New York City, Fishman et al. concluded that the community reflected transitional, or unstable bilingualism. Fishman et al.’s (1971) conclusion about the instability of societal bilingualism in ‘el Barrio’ in relation to diglossia was refuted by a number of researchers studying language use in the same community (Pedraza, Attinasi & Hoffman 1980, Pedraza 1985). These researchers have argued that Spanish is substantially maintained among New York City Puerto Ricans.²

Despite its criticisms, Fishman’s (1967) theoretical conceptualization of the relationships between diglossia and bilingualism has remained at the center of debates around immigrant language maintenance and shift in the U.S. context. It seems highly questionnable, however, that a theoretical model originally based on a societal arrangement of dichotomous use of functional varieties of the same language be transposed to the contact situation of two different languages in an unstable sociopolitical terrain, particularly in the modern-day context. The contact of two genetically distinctive linguistic systems implicates a complex configuration of social, political, and economic values which the use of two less dramatically differentiated varieties of a singular language, in the sociopolitical sense of the term, probably does not.³ For example, the long historical

² Weinreich (1968: 87) also questions the adequacy of the use of ‘domain’ schema in the study of bilingual communities.
³ Refer to Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 9-12) for a discussion of what is understood by the term ‘genetic relationship’ of linguistic varieties.
presence of the German language in Swiss territory provides for a much less benign degree of politicization around the use of Swiss German versus High German in Switzerland than does the presence of Spanish within the borders of the traditionally English-dominant United States. Moreover, the nationwide socioeconomic power attached to the Spanish language in the U.S. is significantly weaker than that attached to either variety of German, Swiss or High, found in Switzerland. These key considerations inherent in the differential use of separate linguistic systems, however genetically or stylistically distinct, are not adequately accounted for in Fishman’s (1967) theoretical model of the relationship between societal diglossia and bilingualism. Romaine (1995) explained:

[T]here is much in modern life which militates against strict compartmentalization of H and L varieties. There has been an increase in open networks, social mobility, more fluid role relationships and urbanization. All of these factors tend to diminish compartmentalization of the two varieties. Many critics of the notion of diglossia have questioned the extent to which the domains originally postulated by Ferguson are unequivocally associated with particular languages. The presence or absence of social compartmentalization in language use leads to different societal arrangements with respect to bilingualism. (37)

Romaine went further to mention that Williams (1987) has argued that “...in so far as the domain segregation found in diglossia is nothing more than a manifestation of the power differential between H and L, the term should be dispensed with” (1995: 37).
Similarly, Weinreich’s notions would also make suspect the applicability of Ferguson’s (1959) concept of diglossic use of H and L varieties to those situations of languages in contact. Weinreich (1968) stated:

The discussion of congruent linguistic and socio-cultural divisions... underscores the difficulty of determining in some cases which language is ‘upper’ or ‘dominant’ in the bilingual community. The very breakdown of communities into mother-tongue groups gives rise to the question: Dominant for whom?... It is doubtful altogether whether it is worth tagging two languages in contact as respectively ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ at any cost.... (98)

Beyond political considerations, a language’s dominance with respect to the individual bilingual is partly determined by the speaker’s attitudes toward that language in its social functions. The individual’s dominant, or primary language may well be the one which she grants greater social prestige, economic value, or which she views as reflecting more positively or worthily on her social identity. She may view a secondary language Y not only as economically useless or socially stigmatized, but she may consider it an unappealing language, even because of the way it sounds or the way native or monolingual speakers interact nonverbally when using the language. The speaker’s attitudes toward the respective languages in the bilingual situation as well as the principal groups or communities which manifest them are of key consideration. In societies which reflect a contact situation, one language often assumes greater prestige than the other. In these cases,

---

4 See, for example, Lambert’s 1960 discussion of the use of matched guise experiments to determine the effect of the social value of respective languages in a bilingual context on the personality judgements made about individuals.
use of the terms ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’ at the social level seems appropriate. Fitting examples are the situations of Spanish in Los Angeles (Silva-Corvalán 1994b) and Quechua in Lima, Perú (Caravedo 1996).

Scholars widely agree that attitudes and motivations play a very significant role in determining language outcomes both at the individual and social levels, as well as in language classrooms (Gardner & Lambert 1972) and bilingual communities (Dorian 1981). The objective classification and measurement of these subjective, complex, and often elusive, changing notions is methodologically challenging, however. Romaine (1995) affirmed that “as with various other concepts discussed in connection with bilingualism such as proficiency and dominance, attitudes may change over time. There can also be discrepancies between what people say and what they do, which has implications for... research” (319).

2.1.3 Theoretical perspectives on bilingual families. Within a theoretical framework, considerations of bilingualism at the familial level represent the necessary and highly complex interface between individual and societal level bilingualism. In a contact situation where bilingualism is widespread, the family may be considered a microcosm of the social values placed on respective languages within the greater community, and the attitudes which bilinguals hold toward each of these. In societies which reflect inequalities in the social, political and economic values between the two languages, as in the previously mentioned cases of Spanish in Los Angeles and Quechua in Lima, the societally subordinate language typically loses individual primacy for some first generation speakers, for the majority of second generation speakers, and more absolutely for the third generation, who shift to
near complete use of the societally dominant language and who may have little or no proficiency in the native language of their grandparents.

Therefore, cross-generational studies in apparent time (as conceptualized in Labov 1972) are theoretical windows into the future of language changes in monolingual communities and, in the case of bilingual communities, language maintenance or shift. We must proceed with caution, however, when applying Labov’s (1972) notions of variation and language change, formulated through observation of monolingual communities, to the realm of research on language maintenance and shift in bilingual communities. In the situation of two languages in contact, sociolinguistic factors motivating language change are doubly at work. Each of the linguistic systems X and Y independently represents its own configuration of interacting spaces of variability, and simultaneously both systems are impacted by the extralinguistic (social, political, geographic and economic) factors resulting from their interdependent relationship for the bilingual individual. This interdependence is borne of the sociolinguistic reality of the individual and played out at the familial level.

The terms ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’, or ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ respectively, take on different meanings and assume distinct theoretical notions at the two levels of bilingualism which we have considered thus far: individual and societal. At the individual level, ‘dominant’ does not assume political, social, or economic importance, rather, it designates the language of principal use and primary cognitive function for the speaker. At the societal level, the terms ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’ connote social, political, and

---

economic values. Language X is ‘dominant’ because it is more widely used in the political realm, has greater purchasing power, or is socially more visible beyond the local level of the bilingual community.

At the familial level, the differential meanings of the terms ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’ conspire to create a much more complex and intricate notion. At this level, the terms reflect a double meaning. Within a singular family living in a bilingual society, language X for member A may be individually ‘dominant’ and socially ‘dominant’; for member B it may be individually ‘dominant’ yet socially ‘subordinate’; for member C it may be individually ‘subordinate’ yet socially ‘dominant’; for member D it may be individually ‘subordinate’ and socially ‘subordinate’. The inverse would be true for a competing language Y in this theoretical family scenario. To elucidate now the conceptualization of the terms ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’ at the familial level, let us assume that the proposed bilingual family lives in Miami, where both Spanish and English represent languages of great importance in the social, political, and economic realms.

Let us suppose that member A was born in Cuba, used only Spanish (language X) for the first thirty years of her life, immigrated to Miami as an adult, and learned English (language Y) after her arrival in Miami. Let us further suppose that she holds a job with a Latin American-based corporation where Spanish is the principal language of communication, and that all of her friends are also primarily Cuban-born Spanish speakers. She views television only in Spanish, listens to Spanish-language radio, and reads Miami’s daily full-feature Spanish-language newspaper, El Nuevo Herald. She always purchases weekly magazines such as Time, Newsweek, and Buen Hogar in Spanish. She shops usually at Sedano’s, a Cuban-owned and operated major supermarket chain in Miami, and always uses Spanish with
salespeople and attendants in stores and restaurants. For member A, Spanish is ‘dominant’ both at the individual and societal levels.

Let us now suppose that member B was also born in Cuba, used only Spanish for the first thirty years of her life, immigrated to Miami as an adult, and learned English after her arrival. She holds a job with a U.S.-based corporation which mostly does business with others to the north, where English is the principal language of communication. Most of her friends are primarily U.S.-born English speakers and Cuban-born Spanish speakers, many of whom use English in their informal everyday interactions. She views some television in Spanish, but normally does so in English. She usually tunes in to English-language radio, but on occasion hears Spanish-language radio. She usually reads the Spanish-language *El Nuevo Herald*, and the Spanish-language versions of *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *Buen Hogar*. She normally addresses salespeople and attendants in stores and restaurants in English, but occasionally does so in Spanish as well. For member B, Spanish is ‘dominant’ at the individual level yet ‘subordinate’ at the societal level.

Family member C was born in the U.S. and learned both Spanish and English simultaneously throughout childhood. Her formal schooling, with the exception of Spanish classes throughout elementary school and again in high school, was realized completely in English. She is the manager of an upscale restaurant frequented primarily by Spanish-speakers, many of whom are tourists and businesspeople from all over Latin America. Most of her coworkers are primarily Spanish-speakers, and the restaurant is owned by an older Cuban entrepreneur who possesses limited proficiency in English. Outside of work, her friends are principally Spanish speakers. She always takes vacations in Spanish-speaking countries of Latin
America. She usually chooses to watch English-language television programs, but watches a favorite Spanish-language soap opera every day and listens mostly to Spanish-language radio stations. She reads only English-language newspapers and magazines. For member C, Spanish is ‘subordinate’ at the individual level yet ‘dominant’ at the societal level.

Member D was also born in the U.S. and learned both Spanish and English simultaneously as a child. She was formally educated completely in English, with the exception of some Spanish classes in elementary school. She is a schoolteacher whose classroom is occupied by both Spanish and English language-background children, but her textbooks and instruction are completely in English. She has a classroom assistant whose primary language is Spanish, and with whom she communicates in Spanish. Outside of work, her friends include both Spanish- and English-speakers, some of whom are also Miami-born Cubans and others who are Latin American-born Spanish-speakers and U.S.-born Black and Anglo English-speakers. She always watches English-language television programs and tunes in to English-language radio stations. She reads only English-language newspapers and magazines. For member D, Spanish is ‘subordinate’ both at the individual and societal levels.

When interactions among these members occur, the same fairly neatly categorized ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’ roles of Spanish language at the individual and societal levels become blurred. For all members A, B, C, and D described above, Spanish could be the ‘dominant’ language at the familial level. However, ‘dominance’ and ‘subordination’ of Spanish may change according to the presence or absence of different family members or the topics of conversation at hand. Some families may be entirely Spanish ‘dominant’, others
entirely English 'dominant', and in others the highly variable use of the two languages would render categorization according to the dominant/subordinate dichotomy impossible, given the immense complexity of the interaction of individual and generational-level variables.

If the separations made between the individual and societal levels in understanding the term 'bilingual' lack neatness and clarity (cf. Adler 1977), the further separation at the familial level blurs the theoretical conceptualization of the phenomenon of bilingualism even more still. But a carefully conceived understanding of the independence and, at the same time, interdependence of the individual, familial, and societal levels of bilingualism as I have developed them here is key to the case which I will make for categorizing Miami as a 'bilingual' city in section 2.2.

2.2. Classification of Bilingual Miami. Based on our discussion thus far, several criteria for classifying a city as 'bilingual' may be postulated. Figure 2, a framework for the characterization of the bilingual metropolitan area, displays these criteria. Since official language policies in the great majority of the world's bilingual contexts seldom reflect sociolinguistic realities, they are not included in this framework. However, the implications of official language policy will be discussed in relation to the context of bilingualism in Miami in section 2.3. In each of the following subsections (2.2.1 through 2.2.6) of the present section, the criteria set forth in the framework displayed in Figure 2 will be elaborated upon in relation to the situation of Spanish and English in present-day metropolitan Miami.
Figure 2
A FRAMEWORK FOR THE CHARACTERIZATION OF
THE BILINGUAL METROPOLITAN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of speakers</th>
<th>Levels of bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*monolinguals of A OR</td>
<td>*individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*monolinguals of B AND</td>
<td>*familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bilinguals of A and B</td>
<td>*societal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*30-50% of total population OR</td>
<td>*dominance in A or B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*30-50% of total population AND</td>
<td>*mixed status of A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*30-50% of total population</td>
<td>*mixed status of A and B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*aural mass communication</th>
<th>*written mass communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*public information</td>
<td>*comparable number and variety of television and radio stations in A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*newspapers and magazines in A and B displayed for sale widely across the metropolitan area, books in A and B available in bookstores and public libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*billboards, street signs, public building and telephone directories, store information widely posted in A and B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Institutional and commercial support

| *mass media | *wide audience support of radio and television stations in A and B, wide readership of newspapers and magazines in A and B |
| *the arts | *wide attendance of cinema, live theater, music concerts, formal lectures and literary readings in A and B, movies in A and B widely available for rent in most major video stores, vocal music in A and B widely available for sale in most major music stores |
| *education | *bilingual programs for A and B widely available to all communities, formal curriculum for both languages at all educational levels |
| *religion | *services and ceremonies of respective major denominations widely conducted in A and B |
| *government and politics | *official documents available in A and B, translation/interpretation widely conducted in courtrooms and political hearings and debates, use of A and B in public offices, equal representation in local level politics of speakers of both A and B |

## Economic viability

| *employment | *comparable availability of jobs across wide salary ranges requiring use of A, B, or both |
| *trade and commerce | *use of both A and B in most restaurants, stores, businesses, banks, and large corporations |
| *socioeconomic class | *comparable numbers of speakers of A, B, and bilinguals occupying the upper, middle and lower classes by occupation and household income |

## Geographic space

| *residence | *communities of speakers of A, B and bilinguals widely located throughout the metropolitan area, with some concentrations apparent |
2.2.1 Number of speakers. As discussed in section 1, the demographic facts of Miami-Dade's situation according to the last U.S. Census fulfill the first criterion postulated here for characterizing the metropolitan area as bilingual. In 1990, Miami-Dade was 22% Anglo (mostly monolingual English-speaking), 21% Black (mostly monolingual English-speaking, but also including a substantial number of French and Creole-speaking Haitians), 10% Jewish (mostly monolingual English-speaking) and 49% Hispanic (mostly bilingual, but also including a substantial number of monolingual Spanish speakers). It is important to recognize that in the areas which form part of, and which are closest to the city of Miami proper, the Hispanic element is even more substantial, meaning that the number of Spanish-speaking monolinguals and Spanish-English bilinguals is substantially greater. In the present-day city proper, we can safely assume that fewer than 1 out of 3 residents are English-speaking monolinguals, in accordance with the 1990 Census data (62.5% Hispanic) and taking into account projections for the 2000 Census based on immigration and migration patterns during the past nine years (probably 70-75% Hispanic). In terms of numbers of speakers of A and B, Miami certainly represents a bilingual situation.

2.2.2 Levels of bilingualism. The second proposed criterion, levels of bilingualism, is also met within the present-day reality of Miami. Both in the city proper and in most other county municipalities, Spanish-English bilingualism is fully evident at all levels. At the individual level, there are a great number of bilinguals who are Spanish-dominant and also a substantial number who are English-dominant (mostly second and third generation speakers). At both the familial and societal levels, both Spanish and English are widely used.
In the case of Miami, I characterize the two languages as having mixed status at the familial and societal levels since, in general terms, neither language is clearly and absolutely classifiable as dominant. For many bilingual families, Spanish remains dominant and for others English seems dominant, and in others both languages are widely mixed both intra-generationally (i.e., among siblings) and cross-generationally (i.e., between parents and children). At the societal level, both languages are highly visible (as explained in section 2.2.3, following) and their use seems highly indiscriminate by the traditional notion of general 'domains'. Both Spanish and English are widely used in the home, in religion, the business world, and in trade and commerce. In the educational realm, formal maintenance bilingual programs abound at the primary level, and a number of private schools at the secondary level focus their curricula on bilingual maintenance. In most high schools and at all of Miami-Dade's major tertiary level institutions, Spanish for Native Speakers (or Spanish-S) courses are widely taught and are in great demand, as are traditional English courses as well as English classes geared toward the non-native speaker (ESL and ESOL). Although English is the dominant language of formal instruction, Spanish is widely used informally in educational institutions, both public and private, at all formational levels.

2.2.3 Visibility. The criterion of visibility reflects the degree to which the two languages are seen and heard in mass communication and public information. In Miami, this criterion also is easily met. Miami has more Spanish-language television channels, radio stations, and newspapers than the cities of Los Angeles and New York combined (Fradl 1996: 9). On both the FM and AM radio dials in Miami, both languages are equally heard. By popularity of radio stations, neither
language seems dominant. There is a wide variety of musical genres broadcast in both languages—traditional, classical, contemporary and pop (AdRatecard 1999).

Television also reflects the importance of both languages. Miami-Dade's number one-rated television station in 1998 was WLTV Canal 23, an affiliate of the Spanish-language Univisión network, which claimed the top spot for both news and primetime programming in 1998's Nielsen ratings (Business Wire 1998, Pérez 1998). Cable access includes several Spanish-language news networks: CNN en español, CBS Telenoticias, Noticias ECO, and Noticias NBC. The international Spanish-language television network conglomerates Univisión and Telemundo, whose programming is seen by millions throughout the U.S. and Latin America, are both headquartered in Miami, as is the HBO Latin America Group which operates and distributes the leading cable and satellite programming services in Latin America and the Caribbean (Business Wire 1999). Though these lists of radio and television stations are far from being exhaustive, they reflect that both languages occupy highly competitive ground in Miami-Dade's broadcast market.

Newspapers, magazines and books are highly visible in both languages. In addition to their expected English-language constituents, the Miami-Dade stores of major nationwide bookstore chains boast large sections of Spanish-language books on a wide variety of topics and from most all literary genres. Smaller, independently owned bookstores also reflect the bilingual reality of Miami society.

Miami's principal newspapers are the English-language Miami Herald (estimated readership of 851,000 daily and 1.2 million on Sundays) and El Nuevo Herald (estimated readership of 210,000 daily and 316,000 on Sundays), its Spanish-language offspring which became
newsroom-independent in 1988 and subscriber and circulation-independent in 1998. Another principal newspaper of wide circulation in the metropolitan area is the Spanish-language *Diario de las Américas* (estimated readership of 133,440 daily and 140,200 on Sundays). All three newspapers are widely distributed throughout the metropolitan area in newsstands and in stores.

Similarly, magazines in both languages are sold and distributed in newsstands and stores. Even most nationwide supermarkets and drugstore chains display for sale at front registers both the English- and Spanish-language editions of such nationally popular magazines as *Time, Newsweek, People, Good Housekeeping* and *Cosmopolitan*, among numerous others. Indeed, dozens of Spanish-language magazines are based in Miami (Booth 1993).

In many nationwide chain stores in Miami-Dade, aisle signs and store information generally appear in both languages in translation. Similarly, store announcements may be heard in both languages. Numerous nationwide chain restaurants in Miami-Dade have menus in both languages in translation, as do a great number of local franchise and non-franchise restaurants. The area’s major hospitals post information in both languages and have bilingual receptionists and information givers. Miami International Airport reflects the same dynamic English-Spanish bilingualism found outside its premises, with directories, information, and signs posted in both languages in translation and frequent announcements heard in translation. Airline, car rental, and general information counters are also English-Spanish bilingual in their great majority, as are airport stores and restaurants.

The yellow pages of the Greater Miami-Dade telephone directory is bilingual, and throughout the metropolitan area, billboard advertisements are seen in both English and Spanish. Street signs,
though generally posted in English (in accordance with Florida's statewide traffic sign system), are also sometimes found in Spanish, particularly if they are in reference to construction-related road closings or traffic delays, of great importance to local traffic flow and immediate commuter needs. Street names are highly visible in both languages, and some streets and avenues have taken on official Spanish-language names only since the 1960's, e.g. Calle Ocho (Southwest Eighth Street) in the city of Miami proper.

2.2.4 Institutional support. As discussed in the previous section, both aural and written mass media offer wide support for English and Spanish in Miami. Spanish-language television has indeed become a pan-American industry in Miami, home to two of Latin America's most widely popular television talk personalities, Cristina Saralegui and Jaime Bayly, whose shows are studio-recorded in Miami and broadcast throughout the Spanish-speaking world. The network morning variety show "Despierta América", seen by viewers all over Latin America, is broadcast from Miami. These examples are only a few of the many which support that international Spanish-language mass communication has become a major industry in Miami.

The arts in Miami flourish with respect to both languages as well. Cinema, live theater, music concerts, formal lectures and literary readings abound in both Spanish and English. With respect to the music industry, however, the dominance of the Spanish language is undeniable. Miami is considered the pop music capital of Latin America (MacSwan 1996). The offices and recording studios of Sony Discos, label of such internationally known top-selling artists as Gloria Estefan, Shakira, Alejandro Fernández, and Ricky Martin, are located in Miami Beach, along with WEA Latina and PolyGram Latino
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(MacSwan 1996). Spanish-language MTV Latino, which is currently gaining wide popularity among younger cable television viewers throughout Latin America and the U.S., is broadcast from studios also located in Miami Beach (MacSwan 1996).

The majority of the metropolitan area’s large music stores distribute and sell remarkably high volumes of cassette and compact disc recordings of Spanish-language music, and the situation of the area’s major movie rental video stores is similar. Beyond their nationwide traditional “Foreign” sections, several nationwide movie rental chains distribute Spanish-dubbed versions of mainstream American English-language films, including new releases. Numerous smaller, independent video rental stores target their selections more exclusively to a Spanish-speaking clientele, while others more clearly represent the English-language audience. Movies, in either case, are widely available in both languages throughout the metropolitan area.

In the educational realm, support for Spanish language instruction is ample. Miami is home to Coral Way Elementary School where, in 1963, the establishment of a highly successful Spanish-English bilingual program geared toward recently arriving Cuban immigrant children inspired a nationwide renaissance in bilingual education, marking the nation’s recuperation from a wave of staunch nationalism and English-only politics in the decades surrounding the two World Wars. Coral Way Elementary’s bilingual success story played a key role in the passing of the 1968 federal Bilingual Education Act which opened the way for federal funding of bilingual programs in public schools nationwide.

The 1997-98 enrollment for Spanish-S (Spanish for Native Speakers) classes in Miami-Dade’s Public School System was 97,086 students, and 62,896 students studied Spanish as a second language.
(Miami-Dade Public Schools 1998). In that year, 48,749 students were enrolled in ESOL programs districtwide, implying that they were Spanish-dominant (Miami-Dade Public Schools 1998). Figures for the 1998-99 academic year are quite similar (Fragas 1999, personal communication).

Amidst heated political debate in California over the efficacy and validity of bilingual programs in recent years, an article appearing in the May 25, 1998 issue of the *Los Angeles Times* (Anderson) compared the dramatically different situations of Los Angeles and Miami, calling the latter a "boomtown of bilingual education." A recently formed community task force on bilingual education in Miami-Dade has set proposals estimated at $2.3 million, seeking to employ dozens of Spanish-English bilingual teachers at all grade levels and open 10 new two-way immersion programs in addition to the 30 two-way programs which are already in operation (Anderson 1998).6

The *Los Angeles Times* article noted that since South Florida's trade with Latin America amounts to billions of dollars a year, business leaders in Miami argue that they quite simply cannot afford to do without bilingual education. According to the report, it is the business community which indeed has created the recent push to bolster bilingual education in Miami-Dade schools. The article quoted James F. Partridge, chief of the Miami-based Latin American and Caribbean Operations Center for Visa International, as saying: "I don't give a hoot about the political aspects of it.... To me, that's a lot of garbage. I'm interested in the financial well-being of this community. We need bilingual people to survive" (Anderson 1998). Partridge's view reflects

---

6 In a two-way immersion program, the student population is half composed of native Spanish-speaking children and the other half native English-speaking children. Instruction and in-class language use is evenly divided between the two languages.
the economic importance and viability of Spanish in Miami area
business, discussed in section 2.2.5.

A number of private schools which are attended by a vast
majority of Hispanics are also of great importance to the support of
Spanish language education in the area. In these schools, Spanish
language use is emphasized both inside and outside of class, and their
graduates reflect high levels of formal and informal proficiency in both
English and Spanish. Most of these private schools are religiously
affiliated.

Use of both languages is greatly reflected in religious ceremony
throughout Miami-Dade. Roca (1991) argued that there is "strong
reinforcement of Spanish language use in South Florida" through
religious ceremony, principally Catholic masses, baptisms, funerals,
communions and weddings. Roca (1991) also reported that a growing
number of Protestant churches in the metropolitan area offer Spanish
language worship services, as do a Sephardic temple in Miami Beach
and a Santería (Afro-Cuban) church in Hialeah whose pastor was
featured in his own local Spanish language television show.

The importance of the Spanish language has permeated the
governmental realm of the city and county as well. Both of Miami-
Dade's last two mayors have been Cuban-background English-Spanish
bilinguals, and the makeup of the County Commission mirrors the
bilingual reality of its constituents. A recent article on race and
ethnicity in Miami politics, published in the Miami Herald,
underscored the importance of being bilingual in local races: "Not only
are campaigns multiethnic and multiracial, they're also often
bilingual.... The candidate who doesn't reflect the electorate on those
demographic traits starts at a deep disadvantage regardless of such
other factors as experience, education or stands on the issues" (Fiedler 1998: 8A).

The results of a poll ("Race and Politics") of 847 people in various ethnic groups across Miami-Dade and Broward counties, reported in the Miami Herald (September 8, 1998: 8A), reflected that 49% of Cubans felt that their ethnic group had "the right number" of public officials in local government, and 24% of Cubans responded that their same ethnicity was overrepresented in local affairs. In the same poll, only 39% of Other Hispanics indicated that their ethnic groups were fairly represented, while 57% felt that they were underrepresented by members of their own groups. The vast majority (70%) of Non-Hispanic Whites felt fairly represented by members of their ethnic group, but the overwhelming response of Blacks (86%) was that their ethnic group had less than its share of public officials. In sum, the results indicate that presently in Miami, both Cubans (principally bilinguals and Spanish-speakers) and Non-Hispanic Whites (principally monolingual English speakers) believe that they are satisfactorily represented in local politics. A comparable percentage of Other Hispanics (principally bilinguals and Spanish-speakers) and Blacks (principally monolingual English speakers) feel that they are underrepresented. By association of ethnic groups, both languages appear to occupy highly competitive space as well as equal shares of representation and underrepresentation in the political arena. As such, language does not appear to be a discriminating factor in the greater political context of Miami, but rather, race seems to be the key factor in governmental underrepresentation.

2.2.5 Economic viability. Miami is a city of great wealth. Prior to the 1960's, Miami’s principal industry was recreation and tourism. Many
American movie stars and celebrities had houses there (as they still do today), and Coconut Grove and Miami Beach's "Gold Coast" were prime vacation destinations not only for sun-seekers from the Northeastern U.S. but also for middle and upper-class Cubans, as mentioned previously in section 1.1. With the arrival of the Cubans, small businesses began to appear and numerous factories located plants in Miami to take advantage of the newly arrived labor force. Over the past four decades, Miami has grown to become a center for international finance, particularly between the U.S. and the Caribbean and Latin America. It is the principal trade port between the U.S. and the Caribbean, Central and South America, and its airport is the busiest hub connecting travelers between North America and countries to the south. It has been termed the "capital of Latin America" (Booth 1993), the "economic capital for U.S. trade with countries to the south," and the "gateway to Latin America" (Américas 1992). Fradd (1996) affirmed the great importance of Miami's business relationship with Latin America:

Metropolitan Miami has more American-owned businesses operating in Latin America, and Latin American-owned businesses operating within it than any other U.S. metropolitan area.... Miami controls 43% of all U.S. trade with the Caribbean, 28% of all U.S. trade with South America, and almost half of all trade with Central America. Approximately 129,000 Greater Miami businesses have ties with countries located south of Florida.... At least 130 international corporations, including Texaco, General Motors, Sony, Nabisco, Komatsu, Airbus, and AT&T, have established their Latin American headquarters in Dade County. (4)
Recognizing that Miami's economy is based heavily on trade and commerce with the Spanish-speaking World, the Spanish language has come to play an equally vital role with English at the economic level. In a survey study (Fradd 1996) including 245 businesses throughout the metropolitan area, 47 reported use of Spanish 11-25% of the time, 66 used it 26-50% of the time, and 33 used it 51-75% of the time. One in ten businesses surveyed said that Spanish was used in 76-100% of their communication, while one in four reported use of Spanish less than 10% of the time (Fradd 1996: 39). Reported English use was somewhat higher. Nearly half of the businesses surveyed reported that 76-100% of their employees conducted business in English, yet one in three survey respondents said that English was used in business communication by less than half of its workforce. Of all the businesses surveyed, 95.7% agreed (60% said "strongly agree") to the importance of having an English-Spanish bilingual workforce in Miami-Dade (Fradd 1996: 42).

The imminence of Spanish in business communication in Miami-Dade may be even greater than Fradd's (1996) study indicates, however. Only 245 of a total 7,300 businesses responded to the survey mailing, though Fradd maintained that a 3% response rate was acceptable for the analysis. However, she did not take into account the paucity of responses from several types of businesses in which Spanish language use is widespread and extremely important in Miami: tourism (only 3 respondents), trade (only 6 respondents), transportation (only 5 respondents), and retail (only 14 respondents). A higher response rate from these sectors of the Miami business world would most likely indicate even greater use and necessity of Spanish. Moreover, Fradd did not indicate in her report whether the survey was distributed in English, Spanish, or both languages, a factor which may
also have impacted to some degree the profile of the total response pool.

Irrespective of its limitations, Fradd’s (1996) study makes clear that both English and Spanish play vital roles in the business world and that being bilingual is a requisite for employment by a great number of businesses. Furthermore, a recent study by Boswell (1999) has pointed out that those Miami Hispanics who identify themselves as English-Spanish bilingual hold a definite economic advantage (based on yearly personal income) over those who identify themselves as Spanish or English monolingual.

With regard to ethnolinguistic divisions between socioeconomic classes, Miami’s situation approximates a socioeconomically balanced bilingual society, although Non-Hispanic Asians and Non-Hispanic Whites appear to be somewhat more accommodated. Boswell and Skop (1995: 35) determined that 29.1% of Non-Hispanic Whites, 32% of Non-Hispanic Asians, and 44.8% of Non-Hispanic Blacks reported personal incomes below $10,000, while 44.6% of Cubans, 43.8% of Colombians, 43.6% of Peruvians, 42.4% of Puerto Ricans, 47.4% of Dominicans, 48.8% of Mexicans and 46.8% of Other Hispanics earned less than $10,000 annually. Slightly more than half of all Nicaraguans and Hondurans earned less than $10,000 in 1989. The upper income categories ($50,000+ per year) were occupied by 12.9% of Non-Hispanic Whites, 6.8% of Non-Hispanic Asians, 1.7% of Non-Hispanic Blacks, 4% of Cubans, 3.7% of Peruvians, 2.8% of Colombians, 2.5% of Mexicans, 2.3% of Puerto Ricans, 2.1% of Dominicans, and 4.9% of Other Hispanics. Only 1.6% of Nicaraguans and 1.1% of Hondurans reported incomes of more than $50,000 in the year prior to the 1990 Census.
Boswell and Skop (1995) combined the variables of personal income with occupational status and educational attainment to conclude that the majority of Miami’s Hispanics comprise the middle class, with the exception of Nicaraguans, Hondurans, and Mexicans. Though Non-Hispanic Whites and Non-Hispanic Asians ranked somewhat higher than other groups according to Boswell and Skop’s composite analysis, they mostly represented the middle class in Miami as well. Non-Hispanic Blacks’ rankings were similar to those of most Hispanic groups, while Haitians reflected the lowest overall position of all the groups under consideration. Boswell and Skop’s study indicated that most English and Spanish-speaking ethnic groups are associated with the middle socioeconomic class in Miami, while the upper classes are principally formed by Non-Hispanic Whites and Non-Hispanic Asians, with Peruvians, Other South Americans, and Jamaicans ranking just below them in the composite analysis carried out by these researchers (1995: 45). Contrary to popular sociological myth, Miami Cubans in 1990 occupied an intermediate position among the whole of the metropolitan area’s Hispanic national groups (Boswell & Skop 1995: 47).

2.2.6 Geographic space. The studies of Boswell (1993) and Boswell and Cruz-Báez (1997) analyzed residential segregation in the Miami-Dade metropolitan area with respect to race, ethnic group, and socioeconomic class. Both studies indicated that communities of Hispanics and Non-Hispanic Whites were located widely throughout the area, with concentrations of Hispanics in Hialeah and Little Havana. Non-Hispanic Blacks tended to be isolated, however, concentrating themselves almost exclusively in the area north of Downtown Miami. Based on these studies, Miami can be considered as
different from most other U.S. urban areas with respect to Spanish-speaking background, socioeconomic class and residential area. In Miami, predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods representing the upper, middle and lower economic classes can be found throughout the metropolitan area. In contrast, for Hispanics in most other U.S. cities, attaining middle or upper class incomes generally implies moving into predominantly Anglo neighborhoods, a move which has a direct impact on language loyalty, attitudes, and use.

2.3 Official English in Florida. By applying the proposed theoretical criteria displayed in Figure 2 to the situation of English and Spanish in Miami (subsections 2.2.1 through 2.2.6), I have attempted to establish that the metropolitan area which is the focus of the present analysis may be characterized as bilingual. Left out of the theoretical framework put forth in section 2.2, however, were considerations of language policy and language standardization since, as stated earlier, policy rarely reflects sociolinguistic reality in the great majority of the world’s regions where language contact occurs. In this section, I will briefly address the politics of language with respect to Miami, highlighting the overwhelming dominance of English.

After the heavy immigrations of Cubans in Miami in the 1960s and the early 1970s, the Board of County Commissioners approved in 1973 a policy of official bilingualism and biculturalism. The policy stood for seven years before coming under attack by a wave of English-only sentiment which would quickly gain momentum, spread to the national level and inspire a countrywide movement to legislate an English-only policy at the federal level (see Valdés 1995b and Zentella 1995, 1996 for discussions of the national English-only movement and its relation to Spanish-speaking groups in the greater U.S. context).
This movement continues in many states, nearly twenty years later. Castro, Haun and Roca (1990) stated that in Florida, "the movement... seemed to arise as if by spontaneous combustion.... (It) was led by non-elite white ethnics and was opposed by the white corporate and civic elite...." a campaign whose tone they described as "exceedingly bitter" (152-153).

The impetus behind the "anti-bilingual" referendum in Miami-Dade was probably the result of a number of factors (Castro, Haun & Roca 1990: 152-153). Miami already lead the nation in the percentage of foreign-born residents by 1980 (35%). In the previous twenty years, the local Anglo majority had witnessed the diminution of its political, sociocultural, economic and linguistic dominance with the arrival of hundreds of thousands of Cubans and other Spanish-speakers. The year 1980 marked another massive arrival of Spanish speakers with the Mariel boatlift and the collapse of the Somoza regime in Nicaragua (as discussed previously), adding to the growing psychological and social discomfort of a number of local-born White ethnics. The development of a Latin "sub-economy" had also marked the same twenty-year period, with the number of Hispanic-owned businesses growing from 3,447 in 1969 to 24,898 by 1982 (Castro, Haun & Roca 1990: 152). The referendum to overturn Miami-Dade's official bilingual and bicultural status was passed on November 4, 1980 by a 59% majority.

By the year 1988, the English-only movement made its way back to Florida, this time at the state level. In November of that year, 84% of the state's voters approved a constitutional amendment to establish English as the official language of Florida. The amendment, which presently remains in the Florida Constitution, declares that, 1) English is the official language of the state of Florida; and 2) the Legislature shall have the power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation
(Castro, Haun & Roca 1990: 151). Proponents of the movement alluded to the growing need for national "unity," a common language and the American mainstreaming of recently arrived immigrants. Opponents pointed out that the legislation would have no effect on the sociolinguistic reality of the state, and would only create greater divisiveness among ethnolinguistic groups. In Miami, grave concerns about the use of languages other than English in business, tourism and trade were also raised by opponents of the amendment who recognized the importance of Spanish to the vitality of the local economy.

Ten years later, the voices of English-only in Miami-Dade have grown quiet, but Official English remains on the books at the state level, and a bill is still pending in the U.S. Congress to make the country officially English-speaking. The state-level Official English policy in the context of Miami-Dade greatly belies the social, demographic, political, economic, and linguistic reality of the people who live there. The official policy on bilingualism and biculturalism has gone undiscussed in Miami-Dade since 1980, while the number of Spanish speakers residing there has more than doubled.

3. The future of Spanish in Miami:

Language maintenance and shift

3.1 The language maintenance question in the Miami context. In one of the first sociolinguistic studies carried out in Miami in 1975, Solé (1979) determined that, at the societal level, Spanish in Miami was consistently renewed through the political and economic power of Spanish-speaking Cubans there, the city’s constant immigration of Spanish speakers, and the use of Spanish in commerce and business. In this way, he highlighted that Spanish had instrumental value in Miami. The results of his questionnaire study additionally indicated
that successive generations of Cubans in Miami maintained very positive attitudes toward Spanish language and bilingual education programs, as did another questionnaire study by Pearson and McGee (1993) nearly twenty years later. Given these two factors underscored by Solé (1979), one might predict that Spanish would be maintained in Miami at the same time that English is adopted, a bilingual situation characterized by language spread instead of language shift.

However, Solé indicated that at the individual level, actual language use by the majority of second-generation bilinguals reflected shift to English, thus bringing him to the conclusion that bilingualism in Miami did not appear stable. In a related article on language loyalty and attitudes, based on the same data pool of 268 questionnaires completed by 14-18 year-old public secondary school students in 1975, Solé (1982) suggested that even though loyalty and attitudes toward Spanish among second-generation Cuban bilinguals in Miami remained very positive, shift to English was imminent. However, in his conclusions he stated that "if language loyalty and language maintenance succeed in Dade County, they will probably respond more to instrumental needs than to deliberate maintenance efforts or ideological elaborations" (Solé 1982: 267).

Indeed, the instrumental value of Spanish in Miami has grown immensely since the time of Solé's study in 1975, and more recent opinions among sociologists of language scrutinizing the issue of maintenance and shift in Miami have become highly mixed. García and Otheguy (1988) related to the context of Miami five theoretical factors postulated by Fishman (1977) as being highly influential in any language maintenance situation. They are: 1) demographic, 2) sociocultural, 3) economic, 4) philosophical/ideological, and 5) political. García and Otheguy argued that "only the demographic factor
is favorable to continuous language maintenance (of Spanish in Miami), whereas the sociocultural, economic, ideological, and political factors are at present creating pressures toward language shift" (186).

Roca (1991) debated the position of García and Otheguy (1988) by providing detailed evidence in support of the future maintenance of Spanish in Miami with relation to most of the principal theoretical factors proposed by Fishman (1977). With regard to sociocultural and economic aspects, Roca affirmed that "(these) factors are difficult to divorce from demographic considerations since the large and increasing numbers of Spanish speakers alone make Miami function today in a radically different manner from the way it did before the extensive Cuban migrations of the sixties and early seventies...," and that "the growing number of... Hispanics who continue to arrive from the Caribbean, Central and South America, has had an overwhelming impact on the social, economic, and linguistic fronts" (1991: 248). Roca went further to point out that, in Miami, Spanish is widely used in religion, business, advertisement, and mass media, and that there is extensive support for Spanish language at all levels of the educational realm. She concluded that the Miami bilingual context is vastly different from other U.S. urban contexts because "the Spanish language presence is visible not just in a 'barrio' or via films, newspapers, radio, television or the cultural arts" (1991: 252). Roca's predictions for the future of the Spanish language in Miami point to its sustained use and widespread visibility well into the next century.

Resnick (1988) took a "wait and see" stance on the question of whether or not Spanish will be maintained among Cubans in Miami. He identified three primary roles in which Spanish is presently used in Miami: 1) as an immigrant language, 2) as the ethnic mother tongue of a large and socially predominant population of Cubans and their
American-born children, and 3) as a language of the Miami marketplace, workplace, and government and politics (1988: 89). Although Resnick did not express certainty that shift to English would inevitably occur among Cubans in Miami, he suggested that 'assimilation' seems highly plausible. He stated:

[T]he assimilatory force of American society continues to operate, and Cubans are too close to mainstream America in their values, ideologies, aspirations and physical characteristics for them not to join it.... We must wait to see whether an EMT (ethnic mother tongue) now in its third generation can survive the cultural assimilation of its speakers in America as in Europe, to be passed on as a stable language of diglossia for future generations. (100-101)

A 1996 study carried out by Lambert and Taylor on language in the lives of Miami Cuban-American families, compared the fluency and use of Spanish and English of first-generation Cuban-born mothers and their second-generation Miami-born offspring. The study's sample of 108 families was divided according to socioeconomic class— one group they considered working class and another they classified as middle class. Their findings were quite suggestive of the social force of Spanish for young Cuban-Americans in Miami. Interestingly, they found that for the working-class families, the correlation between mothers' Spanish fluency and the Spanish fluency of any of their children was not statistically significant, suggesting that outside-family influences are the major factors determining their high level of Spanish ability. More interesting still, the study's data revealed that the more fluent in Spanish the first-born child becomes, the more fluent the second and third-born children of the family become. The
situation of the middle-class families contrasted somewhat. For the middle class, a statistically significant correlation was revealed between mothers’ Spanish fluency and the fluency of the first and second-born children, but not with that of the third-born child. Again, though, as with the working-class families, there were significant correspondences between the Spanish fluency of first-born children and second and third-born children.

As such, Lambert and Taylor (1996) suggested that high levels of Spanish-English bilingual skill in Miami may be the result of quite divergent acquisitional routes and forms of parental support. The working class mothers appeared to promote subtractive bilingualism—a shift to English use for their children, probably due to economic concerns in the broader US context. But the researchers suggested that, in Miami:

[T]he (working class) mothers’ values and wishes have to compete with those circulating in a vibrant Hispanic ethnic community that in certain instances can be strong enough to attenuate the assimilation process. The findings in fact suggest that social forces operating in Miami’s Hispanic community may temper or even override parental orientations by sustaining and nurturing Spanish language skills, particularly for the first-born child, who in turn can have determining influences on the development of Spanish skills of younger siblings, quite independent of the mothers’ inclinations. (496)

Based on the above conclusions (Lambert & Taylor 1996), it seems that social level forces to use Spanish in Miami override what might constitute cross-generational individual level forces promoting simplification and loss of Spanish in most other US contexts. In the
remainder of this chapter, I will provide reasons to support the position taken by Roca (1991) with respect to the future of Spanish in Miami.

3.2 Perspectives on the terms 'assimilation' and 'language loss'. Two highly polemic issues are inherent in the discussion of the future of Spanish in the Miami bilingual context. One of these issues is terminological, and another is methodological. In this section, I will first explain why the use of the term 'assimilation' is problematic in relation to Hispanics in Miami, and I will then turn to a brief consideration of the important methodological limitations of studies to date which have addressed the proficiencies of second and third generation Spanish speakers in the Miami context.

3.2.1 'Assimilation' in the Miami context (?) Portes and Stepick (1993) maintained that "existing 'frames' of what American urban life is like, including those elaborated in the sociological research literature, prove to be of limited utility for rendering events in South Florida understandable" (9). They explained that "in Miami, the regrouped Cuban bourgeoisie not only redefined the character of the city, but also prompted other ethnic communities—native Blacks and Whites included—to cast their own identities in sharper relief..." (xii). These authors have termed Miami a unique societal experiment which may offer great insights into the future social profile of major urban areas all across the U.S.

Miami has become an experiment because its circumstances are unparalleled in the immigrant history of the United States. With the redefinition of Miami's sociodemographic makeup, economic and political structures, and the widespread visibility of Hispanic cultural
elements such as food, music, and dance, being "American" in Miami has come to mean something socially quite different than what it meant prior to the 1960s and 1970s. In a city which represents a bilingual and bicultural reality, it seems somewhat suspect to talk about "assimilation." Assimilation to what?

The use of the term "assimilation" is methodologically quite vague. Generally, assimilation in U.S. sociological literature has referred to assimilation to the American White Anglo sociocultural and English-speaking linguistic mainstream, with a concomitant rise in income and socioeconomic status. Lorenzo-Hernández (1998) defined assimilation as "an ongoing process of absorption into the category that has more power and control over the available resources in the host society" (47). Kelly and Schaufler (1996) stated that "assimilation is linked to an expectation that foreigners will shed, or at least contain, their native cultures while embracing the mores and language of the host country" (30). Hirschman (1996) considered that the process of "Americanization" was most readily measured by immigrants' age of arrival and the duration of their residence in the U.S., yet he went further to state that:

[T]he immigrant and ethnic communities in Los Angeles, Miami, and New York are very different from each other and from almost every other metropolitan area in the country. With such great diversity and weak data resources, knowledge about the social, economic, and cultural mobility of the post-1965 wave of immigrants often seems to rest more on impressionistic information than on solid evidence. (1996:80)

Application of the term "assimilation" to the Miami context seems problematic because the term inherently relies on a traditional,
pre-established concept of the "mainstream." The modern mainstream of Miami is immigrant, bilingual, and bicultural, a mainstream in which Spanish-speaking immigrants and their second generation offspring greatly define the middle classes and, to some extent, the upper classes. Portes and Stepick (1993) clarified that in Miami, "there is no mainstream. The hegemony of the old 'upper-uppers' has given way to parallel social structures, each complete with its own status hierarchy, civic institutions, and cultural life" (8). Given the unique sociopolitical situation of Spanish-speaking immigrants and their subsequent generations in Miami, the term "assimilation" by appeal to notions of economic and political power, upward socioeconomic mobility, and adaptation to American sociocultural "mores" is rendered amorphic. In essence, we are left with the question of linguistic adaptation, that is, language shift from the exclusive use of Spanish to the exclusive use of English, and the bilingual situation which may result in between.

3.2.2 Understanding 'loss' in methodological language studies. Empirical studies relevant to language shift among Spanish-speaking immigrants and their succeeding generations in Miami have been methodologically quite limited and considerably few in number. Thus far, the studies carried out in Miami have approached the question of language shift among second and third generation immigrants using a sociological questionnaire focused on language use preferences and self-reported language abilities (cf. Lambert & Taylor 1996, Pearson & McGee 1993, Portes & Schauffler 1996, Solé 1979, 1982). Although the data provided by such questionnaires is generally quite insightful where language use, preferences, and attitudes are concerned, they
render an understanding of a sociolinguistic reality based only on self-report and not on actual language use.

Where issues of fluency and proficiency are concerned, self-report data are sometimes highly unreliable, particularly so in contexts where speakers possess socially or academically imposed inferiorities about their linguistic skills in a certain language. Such is usually the case of adolescent and adult second language learners in the classroom as well as bilinguals in the greater social context (cf. Gardner, Lalonde, Moorcroft & Evers, 1987; Gardner & Smythe, 1975; Gardner, Smythe & Brunet, 1977; Kraemer & Zisenwine, 1989; MacIntyre, 1992; MacIntyre, Noels & Clément, 1997).

In the present research, many of the second and third generation speakers interviewed reported being told by their elders and other recently-arrived Spanish-speaking immigrants that their Spanish was "bad", "incorrect" or "not Spanish." Interestingly, however, none of them recalled experiencing breakdowns of communication in Spanish with the same speakers who negatively appraised their linguistic skill. While a number of the first-generation immigrants interviewed did affirm the opinion that many Miami-born Spanish speakers used "bad" or "incorrect" Spanish at times, none reported not being able to understand them in Spanish. Moreover, very few first-generation interviewees reported that their own second and third-generation family members and acquaintances spoke Spanish "poorly" or "not at all."

As Labov (1972) so carefully pointed out in his original works in sociolinguistics, impressionistic observations of language use may be unreliable in the empirical sense. These observations of "bad" or "incorrect" language skill generally reflect a listener's focus on another speaker's use of a nonstandard or sociolinguistically norm-deviant
variant which in actuality occurs in a quite limited number of contexts and utterances. Such variants rarely if ever lend themselves to breakdowns of communication. The criticisms which these variants invoke, however, often do lead bilinguals to a false sense of insecurity about their abilities in one or both languages. In this way, these individuals may represent socially highly competent speakers of two languages who are considerably incompetent at self-evaluating their own overall proficiencies and abilities in one or both languages. For this reason, conclusions about language proficiency based on self-report questionnaire responses must be viewed skeptically. Authentic, recorded speech put to linguistic-level analysis is unquestionably the most reliable gauge of individual language proficiency. To date, none of the evidence from the Miami bilingual context is the product of such an analysis.

3.3 The future of Spanish-speaking Miami. While loss of Spanish by successive generations in Miami may appear imminent based on questionnaire data, conclusions based on the objective analysis of demonstrated language ability may render a quite different pattern, a pattern such as the one discussed in this dissertation. Many crucial factors have gone unmentioned in the previous research on Spanish language in Miami, ones which I have attempted to highlight in the previous pages.

While cross-generational language loss in the traditional sense of the word does appear to be a reality for some, many others, if not the majority, reflect a high degree of cross-generational Spanish language maintenance. Are these speakers "assimilated?" Are they "American?" The answer to both questions is yes. These speakers are the social, linguistic, and psychological product of the reality in which
they live, and that reality is one characterized by an extraordinarily high degree of societal bilingualism and biculturalism entirely unique in the U.S. context. Their assimilation to the Miami mainstream reflects the widespread use and positive sociocultural and economic value of two languages—English and Spanish.

The future maintenance of the Spanish language in Miami seems likely for a number of reasons:

1. As pointed out by Roca (1991), Spanish language maintenance is supported with respect to four of the theoretical factors posed by Fishman (1977) in reference to any bilingual situation: demographic, sociocultural, economic, philosophical/ideological. The fifth factor, political, is unsupported in Miami, since there is no official policy on Spanish language use there. However, the politics of bilingual education in Miami-Dade public schools are highly supportive of Spanish use and study. Most private schools, of a Hispanic-origin majority, represent even greater support of Spanish in the educational domain.

2. At the eve of the new millennium, Miami's sociolinguistic reality is bilingual. The criteria proposed by the theoretical framework elaborated in section two of this chapter are all fully met within the Miami context. The label "bilingual" is quite appropriately applied to Miami with respect to the number of speakers of English and Spanish, the levels of bilingualism manifested there, and the visibility, institutional and commercial support, and economic viability of both languages. It was also explained that the criterion of geographic space is additionally fulfilled in present-day Miami-Dade. Based on present social trends and population projections, the bilingual characterization of Miami society is unlikely to shift in the coming decades (Roca 1991).
3. Immigration is ample and constant in Miami-Dade. The linguistic value of this continuous influx of Spanish monolingual immigrants is quite significant. First, it points to the continued use of Spanish at the societal level. Second, it means that a substantial number of U.S.-born bilinguals will experience generational "recontact" with the language (as termed by Cisneros & Leone, 1983) as Spanish monolingual family members arrive and friendships, romances, marriages, and work partnerships arise between recently arrived immigrants and second, third, and fourth-generation bilinguals. In a city where new immigration is at such a high rate and where Hispanics are the demographic majority, the probability that already-established immigrants and their offspring will have intimate social contact with recently-arrived Spanish monolinguals is considerably high. There is no evidence to suggest that immigration into Miami from the Spanish-speaking world will wane in the coming decades. Moreover, as was the case of the Cuban and Nicaraguan immigrations in Miami, any major political upheavals in Latin American countries could prompt additional waves of Hispanic immigration in the future, further broadening the sociolinguistic landscape of Spanish-speaking Miami.

4. Since the great majority of Miami's Spanish-speakers are of Cuban origin, any future change in U.S.-Cuba political relations could greatly impact the use of Spanish in Miami. A more open social exchange between Miami and Havana would most likely lead to the linguistic renewal of Cuban Spanish in Miami, and perhaps bring some English-Spanish contact phenomena (cf. Varela 1992) to the sociolinguistic landscape of Havana. The two cities represent the largest populations of Cubans in the world, quite similar in number. This important demographic factor and the cities' close geographic
proximity coupled with the facility of modern-day air travel would create a highly dynamic social exchange at the linguistic and cultural levels (Gutiérrez 1998, personal communication). In this sense, the fall of Castro’s government may have a much stronger impact in sociolinguistic terms than in purely political or economic terms. Numerous studies have already supported that an extreme minority of Miami Cubans would actually return to live in Cuba in the wake of political and economic reform there. Boswell (1994) estimated that not more than 5% of the total Miami Cuban population would return to live on the Island in Castro’s absence, stating employment, business and family ties to Miami and the housing shortage and greatly decayed infrastructure of modern-day Cuba as the principal reasons (42-43). Conversely, it is likely that given the freedom to leave the island, substantial numbers of Cubans would emigrate to Miami, many to establish residence there.

5. Miami’s sociocultural, economic and geographic intimacy with many countries of the Spanish-speaking World make its bond with the Spanish language seemingly undeniable in the globalization of the coming decades. Miami will likely continue to grow as an economic center for Latin American trade and finance, meaning that in the professional and business arena, Spanish will continually gain instrumental value and a bilingual workforce will be of the essence (Fradd 1996). The rise of Miami in the 1990s as a center for world-wide Spanish-language mass communication and music production will additionally secure the importance of the language there. The sociocultural image of Miami now held by many contemporary middle and upper class Latin Americans means that the city will continue to host thousands of Spanish-speaking tourists and vacation-home dwellers on a yearly basis, all of whom require services in Spanish. As
these tourists and visitors mingle socially with U.S.-born bilingual speakers in places like trendy South Miami Beach and Coconut Grove, the image of the Spanish-speaking World held by second, third- and fourth-generation speakers who have never traveled outside the U.S. will continue to be positively influenced, as it is today. In Miami, Spanish is not viewed principally as a language of the elderly (grandparents) or the economically poor, but also as a world language of chic younger speakers of the middle and upper socioeconomic classes. This is a condition which likely will not change in the coming decades.

Summary and conclusions

In this chapter I have attempted to place the present-day situation of Spanish-speaking Miami in sociolinguistic perspective. In section one, I reviewed the demographic makeup of the metropolitan area, and explained that the emergence of Miami-Dade as a major city in the past thirty years is inextricably bound to its "Cubanization" and "Hispanicization", as termed by Boswell (1994). I established that in Miami-Dade, Hispanics represent nearly 50% of the population, and are a clear and highly visible majority in many major municipalities such as the city of Miami proper, Miami Beach, Hialeah, Sweetwater, and West Miami.

In section two, I visited some basic theoretical concepts behind the study of bilingualism, and then postulated a theoretical framework for classification of the bilingual metropolitan area. In what followed, I explained that present-day Miami fulfills practically all of the proposed criteria for labeling it as "bilingual." In the sociolinguistic sense, Miami is entirely unique in the U.S. and Latin American contexts.
In section three, I described the present-day polemic around Spanish language maintenance and loss in Miami. While some suggest that Spanish will inevitably disappear from Miami’s future social configuration, others believe that a wide range of factors contribute to its continued maintenance there. I pointed to the paucity of research and the methodological limitations of studies to-date which address the issue of Spanish language use, maintenance and shift in Miami. I underscored the problematic conclusions and assumptions based wholly on questionnaire responses, and then highlighted that the most reliable studies on which to base conclusions about language maintenance are those driven by an empirical sociolinguistic methodology entailing the careful analysis of tape-recorded data of actual language use. I took the position that the sociolinguistic evidence which we have from present-day Spanish-speaking Miami suggests that Spanish probably will continue to be maintained there well into the coming decades, at the societal level to a high degree, and at the generational and individual levels to a considerable degree as well.
Chapter Four

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodological approach taken in the present analysis. In section one, the intergenerational sample of speakers included in this study is described and, in section two, the instrumentation is explained. Sections three and four then respectively highlight the procedures for data collection and the procedures for analysis.

1. Sample

Subjects for the present study were recruited through Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) courses at the University of Miami during the fall semester of 1998, and through the researcher's informal social networks on the University of Miami campus and in the greater metropolitan Miami area.

In all cases, subjects were told that the researcher was interested in the situation of Spanish in Miami and the use of Spanish among bilinguals, and were asked if they would be interested in participating in a language study. In the cases of those subjects recruited through university Spanish for Native Speakers courses, this information was accompanied by a written description (see Appendix 1) of the study being carried out, clarifying that participation in the study was purely voluntary and in no way would affect their academic status in the course nor their relationship with the course instructor. Those who were interested gave telephone numbers or e-mail addresses to the
contact person, who then forwarded the information to the present investigator. The subjects were subsequently contacted by telephone or e-mail to arrange a time most convenient for them to complete the interview. Every speaker who participated in the study agreed to do so voluntarily.

In most cases, the speakers who participated seemed very interested in the nature of the research at hand, and were curious about the central issues being considered in the study. However, no speaker was told that the focus of the analysis was the use of subjunctive forms. Rather, the study was always explained to them in general terms of one that sought to analyze the use of Spanish among bilinguals in Miami, and measure certain aspects of language proficiency. They were told that the researcher was greatly interested in their ideas and opinions with respect to a number of current social, political and cultural issues. It was explained that their tape-recorded interviews would be transcribed and linguistically analyzed by the researcher as part of a study on the use of Spanish among Miami bilinguals.

The present data pool comprised a total of thirty speakers of Cuban origin, divided into three groups, which I will refer to here as 'generations' (first, second, and third). My use of the term 'generation', however, is not understanding age as a variable, but rather birthplace and age of immigration into the U.S. As such, generations in the present study are called such in apparent time (cf. Labov 1972) rather than real time. The sociolinguistic background of each of these thirty speakers is briefly described in the following paragraphs. Section 1.1 describes the speakers comprising the first generation (Group 1), section 1.2 the second generation (Group 2), and section 1.3 the third generation (Group 3).
1.1 First generation speakers. The first generation (N=10) comprised those speakers born in Cuba who arrived to Miami as adults. Four of them were males (speakers F1, M1, P1, Y1) and the remaining six females (A1, D1, E1, II, L1, R1). F1 (73 years old) had come to Miami from Cuba at age 42, and spoke English only very minimally. M1 (34 years old) had immigrated to Miami as a 'balsero' at age 33, and spoke English only very minimally. P1 (age 57) left Cuba immediately after the revolution in 1960, and lived in Brazil and California before settling in Miami. P1 spoke highly proficient English as well as Portuguese due to his time spent in Brazil. His dominant and principal language of use, by self-report, was Spanish. Y1 (age 48) had lived five years in Miami since immigrating from Cuba. He was proficient in English though his skills were, in his terms, "very basic." His dominant language remained Spanish.

One of the seven females (L1, age 43) included in the study might actually be considered what Pérez Firmat (1994) has called the "1.5 generation" since she arrived to Miami from Cuba as a teenager, at age 15. For purposes of the present linguistic analysis, L1 was classified as a first generation speaker for a number of reasons. Although she had lived most of her life in the U.S. (in Miami), she held a Ph.D. degree in Hispanic Literature, was an accomplished Spanish-language writer and a teacher of Spanish at the university level. Additionally, she reported using principally Spanish in her everyday life, both at work and at home.

The remaining first generation female speakers had all arrived in Miami during adulthood. A1 (55 years old) arrived to live permanently in Miami at age 23, after living four years in Central America upon leaving Cuba in 1961. A1 reported a great degree of proficiency in English, though she used mostly Spanish in her everyday life at work and at home. R1 (age 56) came to Miami from
Cuba at age 38. She reported only minimal proficiency in English. Interestingly, R1's son (R2) was also included in the present study as part of the second generation data. E1 (age 66) had immigrated from Cuba to Miami at the age of 52. She spoke "very little" English according to self-report. Speaker D1 (age 56) also reported being able to speak "very little" English. D1 arrived in Miami after leaving Cuba at age 37. I1 was the oldest subject included in the present study (age 76). She spoke little to no English, despite the fact that she had lived in Miami for nearly forty years (since 1960). Her husband (F1) was also part of the first generation data included in the present investigation.

1.2 Second generation speakers. The second generation speakers (N=10) were those bilingual speakers who were either born in Miami to Cuban immigrant parents, or who had migrated to Miami from Cuba before adolescence, some time before the age of 10. Of the present sample considered second generation, three were females (I2, L2, S2) and seven were males (A2, C2, H2, J2, N2, R2, T2), all between the ages of 18-27. It is important to point out that there were two speakers included in the second generation data who came to the U.S. after beginning school in Cuba—R2 came to Miami at age 8, and H2 came just a few days after his tenth birthday. Speakers A2, C2, L2, T2 came to Miami before the age of 3, and speakers I2, J2, N2 and S2 were born in Miami. None of these speakers had been enrolled in bilingual programs in their primary or secondary school years. Out of the total of ten speakers considered second generation, six (A2, C2, I2, J2, S2, T2) were enrolled in the first course of a two-semester Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) sequence at the University of Miami during Fall 1998. Speaker L2 had studied Spanish previously at the university level, and had recently completed bachelor's degrees in History and Religion. The remaining three second generation speakers (H2, N2, R2) had
never studied Spanish at the college level, nor did they express interest in ever doing so. All ten speakers comprising this group considered themselves "bilingual" in terms of proficiency in both Spanish and English.

1.3 Third generation speakers. Those speakers who were born in Miami and had at least one parent corresponding to the second generation were classified as third generation bilinguals (N=10), all between the ages of 18-23. Among these speakers, seven were females (A3, C3, D3, E3, I3, M3, Y3) and three were males (G3, O3, S3). All of these speakers reported that they preferred the use of English in their everyday lives, and all said that they felt more "comfortable" using English in both spoken and written discourse. None of these speakers had been enrolled in bilingual programs in their primary or secondary school years. At the time of the study, all ten were enrolled in the first course of a two-semester Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) sequence at the University of Miami. All ten reported that they took the course to fulfill the University's foreign-language requirement toward their majors. Only three of them had studied Spanish in high school; none of them expressed plans to continue studying it beyond the basic two-course university-level requirement.

2. Instrumentation

Spontaneous oral discourse was the main source of data analyzed in this dissertation. Written data were also collected from a subsample (N=13) of second and third generation speakers to be considered in the analyses. The instruments used to collect these data are described in the following paragraphs.
A series of prepared questions served to guide informal interviews carried out with each of the speakers (see Appendix 3 for the list of questions in its entirety). All of these guide questions were approved by both the University of Minnesota Human Research Subjects Committee and the University of Miami Human Research Subjects Committee prior to starting the data collection.

Some of the questions aimed at basic sociolinguistic background information about the speaker. These questions are displayed below in Figure 3.

**Figure 3**

*Interview guide questions covering sociolinguistic background information*

- ¿Cuántos años tienes?
- ¿Dónde naciste? ¿De dónde son tus padres? tus abuelos?
- ¿Cuándo viniste a EE.UU.? ¿Cuándo vinieron tus padres a EE.UU? tus abuelos?
- ¿Qué lengua hablaste primero—español o inglés? ¿Usas español en casa? de niño/a?
- ¿Aprendiste español en la escuela? ¿Dónde asististe a la escuela primaria? secundaria? ¿Recibiste educación bilingüe?
- Describe a tu familia un poco. ¿Con quién(es) hablas español? ¿Con quién(es) hablas inglés normalmente? ¿Quién es la persona más "interesante" de tu familia? Describela.
- (If not born in Miami) ¿Cuándo viniste a Miami? ¿Cuáles fueron tus primeras impresiones de la ciudad?
- (In the case of university students) ¿Por qué decidiste asistir a la universidad?
- ¿Vives en el campus? (or) ¿Cómo es tu vecindario? ¿Cómo es un día típico para ti? ¿Usas mucho español en tus interacciones con otras personas?
- ¿Cómo era el vecindario donde vivías de niño? ¿Hay/había mucha gente allí que habla/ab español?

Most of the other questions were formulated to elicit the present and past subjunctive forms as well as the conditional forms since these forms may vary with the past subjunctive in hypothetical discourse
contexts, particularly in Caribbean Spanish. Some of the questions already had proven to be successful in eliciting subjunctive and conditional forms in a pilot study (Lynch 1997) that analyzed the oral narratives and hypothetical discourse of U.S.-born college-enrolled Hispanic bilinguals. To these questions several others were added for the present investigation. The list of questions used for the present purposes is found below in Figure 4.

Figure 4
Interview guide questions

• (in the case of university students) ¿Qué te gusta de esta universidad? ¿Qué no te gusta? ¿Qué cambiarías en la universidad si tuvieras el control de hacerlo? ¿Qué le recomendarías al presidente de la universidad?
• ¿Qué habrías hecho si no hubieras decidido asistir a la universidad?
• Completa esta afirmación: Yo me mudaría de Miami si....
• Describe un lugar ideal para vivir, en tu opinión.
• Responde a esta afirmación: Es importante ser bilingüe en Miami.
• ¿Piensas que Miami es una verdadera ciudad "bilingüe"? ¿Cómo ves las divisiones sociales entre el inglés y el español en Miami?
• ¿Qué crees que pasaría si el uso del español fuera prohibido en todo Miami?
• ¿Crees que alguien te discriminó alguna vez por ser hispana/o o por hablar español? ¿Qué pasó?
• ¿Crees que se le hace difícil a la persona que no hable inglés vivir aquí en Miami? ¿Las personas que sólo hablan español sufren mucha discriminación acá?
• Si tuvieras la oportunidad, ¿visitarías a Cuba? ¿Qué harías allí? ¿Cuáles serían los aspectos positivos de tal visita?
• Si Castro perdiera control de Cuba mañana, ¿cómo respondería la comunidad cubana en Miami? ¿Piensas que mucha gente regresaría a Cuba?
• Completa esta afirmación: Cuba estaría en mejores condiciones hoy si....
• ¿Cuál es tu opinión sobre la relación política entre EE.UU y Cuba?
• ¿Piensas que saldrías con alguien o te casarías con alguien que no fuera cubano/a? que no fuera hispano/a? que no hablara español? ¿Cómo reaccionaría tu familia?
• Describe a tu pareja ideal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Te casarías o te comprometerías con alguien que fuera de otra raza u otra religión?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cómo reaccionaría tu familia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué esperas que puedas lograr en los próximos diez años?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in the case of university students) Completa esta afirmación: Cuando me gradúe quiero encontrar un trabajo que...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Describe un trabajo/una carrera ideal para el futuro. ¿Qué tipo de trabajo quieres?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué harías si ganaras la lotería?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué quieres para tus hijos cuando ellos sean adultos? ¿Será importante el español para tus hijos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué esperaban tus padres de ti cuando eras niña/o?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué dudas tienes respecto al futuro?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿De qué estás seguro para el futuro?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Estás de acuerdo con que el Presidente Clinton deba renunciar por el escándalo Lewinsky? ¿Cuál es tu opinión? En su situación, ¿qué harías?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Crees que algún día un hispano llegue a ser presidente de EE.UU.? una mujer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Votarías por una mujer para la presidencia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cuál es tu opinión respecto al movimiento English Only en EE.UU.? ¿Cuál crees que es el propósito de ese movimiento?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Cuál es tu opinión sobre la importancia o la falta de importancia de los programas de educación bilingüe para niños en las escuelas públicas en EE.UU.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Es verdad que la violencia en la televisión y las películas les afecta a los niños?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Es un problema la violencia en las escuelas aquí en Miami? y las drogas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instrument used to collect written data from a subsample of second and third generation speakers included in this study was a sentence completion task that included 30 items in which the subjunctive may appear either categorically or variably in normative Spanish and one item in which the indicative is categorically expected in normative Spanish (see Appendix 4 for the instrument in its entirety). This 31-item instrument aimed to assess the speakers' usage
of the subjunctive in various syntactic/semantic contexts. It was a task focused on form as such, and not on broader discourse-level usage.

The purpose of the task was to lend some further insights into the linguistic system of these bilinguals relevant to mood distinction. First, the task provided the analysis with data relevant to mood selection in specific syntactic/semantic contexts that may not have occurred in speech during the oral interview, simply due to the nature of the discourse. Second, the written task offered some security to the assumption that if the subjunctive was absent in a particular syntactic/semantic context in both the spontaneous speech and the prompted writing of a speaker, then that syntactic/semantic context generally did not fall within the complex of usages linguistically associated with the subjunctive by that speaker (cf. Silva-Corvalán 1994b).

3. Procedures for data collection
Oral discourse was collected from all thirty speakers in informal, tape-recorded individual interviews of 45-75 minutes in length. All interviews were conducted by the present researcher in a place most convenient for the interviewee; some were carried out on the campus of the University of Miami and others were recorded in the homes of the respective speakers. The atmosphere of all of the interviews was informal. The 'tú' form of address was used with all speakers except those who were much older than the investigator. With the older speakers, the 'usted' form of address was used.

Prior to starting the interview, each subject read and signed an official consent form (see Appendix 2) approved by both the University of Minnesota Human Research Subjects Committee and the University of Miami Human Research Subjects Committee. Any doubts or
questions that speakers had about the methodology of the investigation were answered before tape-recording began.

The interview guide questions displayed in Figures 3 and 4 (above) were used selectively in each of the interviews. Not all of the speakers were asked the same questions, and none of the speakers was asked all of the questions. Since the interviews were informal and the conversation was intended to be unrestricted, the speaker also gave direction to the content of the interview, on many occasions leading the conversation into topics and matters not formally anticipated by the investigator. In all interviews, however, the investigator made a deliberate attempt to keep the discussion aimed at discourse contexts for usage of the subjunctive forms, such as opinions, suggestions, value judgments, hypothetical situations, and the like.

Those speakers who were enrolled in a university Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) course at the University of Miami during the Fall 1998 semester (N=16) were asked to complete the 31-item written sentence completion task. These subjects were asked to complete the task at home in their own free time. Thirteen of these sixteen subjects subsequently returned the task to their respective course instructors, who then gave it to the investigator; the remaining three (J2, I3, M3) did not complete it.

Completion of the written task was strictly voluntary and had no implication in course grading. It was not considered as an assignment for any course; this point was made clear to all subjects who completed it. The written task was filled out and returned in the weeks prior to formal instruction on the use of the subjunctive and conditional verb forms in Spanish, so as to prevent as much as possible the effect of formal instruction on the written forms which they produced. The subjects were asked by their course instructors to consult no grammar references, dictionaries, or verb paradigms in completing the task; the
importance of the spontaneity of their responses was explicitly stressed. Those remaining speakers who were not part of such a course (N=14) were not asked to complete the written task, for the sake of their time and convenience.

4. Procedures for data analysis

All of the tape-recorded conversations were transcribed in Spanish by the investigator and then proof-edited by a native speaker of Caribbean Spanish, also a Ph.D. candidate in Hispanic Linguistics. The analysis of the oral data is described in section 4.1, and a description of the analysis of the subsample of written data is described in 4.2. The statistical procedures followed to analyze the data are described in 4.3.

4.1 Oral data analysis. In the transcriptions of the tape-recorded conversations, all discourse and grammatical contexts which condition usage of the subjunctive forms, both past and present, in modern-day normative Spanish were identified, and the appearances of the subjunctive and conditional forms were highlighted. The contexts in which the forms occurred (or did not occur, in variation with indicative forms) were classified as either categorical or variable.

The categories for subjunctive usage followed in the present analysis were based on those explained and identified by Ocampo (1990) and Silva-Corvalán (1994a) in their cross-generational studies of Mexican Spanish in Los Angeles. Of the eighteen categories defined by Silva-Corvalán (1994a), eleven were adopted in the present investigation. These were volition, purpose, concessive, comment, modal, temporal, apodosis, protasis, uncertainty, adjective, and hypothetical manner. The remaining seven identified by Silva-Corvalán were eliminated for the present analysis because a very limited number of representative tokens occurred in the data. Added
to the eleven presently included categories was another context of usage—negated causative—not included in Silva-Corvalán's (1994a) study but identified by Ocampo (1990). Also included in the present investigation were four other categories not considered separately in the analyses of Ocampo nor Silva-Corvalán—possibility, no sé si clauses, depende de clauses, and idiomatic usage of the subjunctive, e.g. o sea, vaya, lo que sea, lo que fuera, comoquiera, and so forth.

Figure 5 lists the sixteen categories included in the present analysis. The contexts identified as categorical contexts for the subjunctive in normative modern-day Spanish were the four at the top of the list in Figure 5: volition, purpose, temporal with futurity, and hypothetical manner. The following eight (comment, concessive, possibility, uncertainty, negated causative, adjective, 'depende de', 'no sé si') were considered variable contexts for subjunctive/indicative usage, conditioned by the semantic and pragmatic values associated with the discourse context in which the verb is found (as has been explained previously in Chapter Two). The categories protasis, apodosis, and modal comprise hypothetical discourse. The final category, to which the subjunctive/indicative opposition does not apply, is idiomatic usage of the subjunctive.
4.2 Written data analysis. The analysis of the subsample of written data appealed to the same sixteen categorical and variable contexts for subjunctive usage displayed in Figure 5. The following items from the written sentence completion task (see Appendix 4), completed by those second and third generation speakers enrolled in a university SNS course, were considered variable contexts for the subjunctive: 1, 3, 7,
10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29 and 30. Those items which were considered categorical contexts were: 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 19, 26, 27, 28, 31. Item 6 was considered a categorical context for use of the imperfect indicative in modern-day normative Spanish. In item 18, the conditional indicative would be expected in most varieties of modern-day Spanish.

4.3 Statistical analysis. All of the data, both oral and written, were entered into the statistical program SPSS 6.1 for MacIntosh. The independent variables used to organize the data were speaker, birthplace (Miami or Cuba), generation (one, two, or three), and gender (male or female). The dependent variables analyzed were the sixteen categories for subjunctive usage listed in Figure 5 (above).

Each of the sixteen categories, excepting the idiomatic usage category, was divided into two columns—one reflecting the raw frequency of the subjunctive and another reflecting the raw frequency of the indicative. For example, the category 'volition' was divided into 'volition/subjunctive' and 'volition/indicative.'

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine any statistically significant differences in the frequency of usage of each verb form within each dependent variable by the factor of generation (Group 1=first generation, Group 2=second generation, Group 3=third generation). A Post-hoc Scheffé analysis for each category was also performed to determine statistical significance of between-group differences.
Summary and conclusions

The present chapter has explained the methodological framework of this investigation. In section one, the thirty Cuban-origin speakers comprising the present sample were described, in addition to the recruitment procedures followed. I explained that the thirty speakers were divided into three groups, or generations in apparent time, based on birthplace and time of arrival in the U.S. The first generation (N=10) comprised those speakers who were born in Cuba and who came to Miami as adults. All were Spanish-dominant and most had very minimal proficiency in English, according to self-report. The second generation (N=10) included those bilingual speakers who were either born in Miami or who immigrated to Miami from Cuba during childhood, prior to adolescence. Those speakers who were classified as third generation (N=10) were born in Miami and had at least one parent who could be considered as second generation.

Section two displayed the questions used to guide oral interviews with the speakers, and stated that a written sentence completion task was also used for a subsample of second and third generation subjects enrolled in a university Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) course. Section three then described the procedures followed to gather the data.

In section four, I explained that in the present data analysis, subjunctive usage was considered variable in some contexts and categorical in other contexts, as elaborated in Chapter Two. The sixteen categorical and variable contexts identified for the present purposes were listed, with examples, in Figure 5. These categories were based principally on those followed by Silva-Corvalán (1994a) and Ocampo (1990). I stated that One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Post-
hoc Scheffé tests were used to reveal any statistically significant between-group differences in the frequency of subjunctive and indicative usage within the sixteen categories of analysis identified.

The findings of the analyses described in this chapter are the focus of Chapter Five.
Chapter Five

Findings

Introduction

This chapter reveals the empirical findings of the present study, in response to the original research questions posed in Chapter Two. In the following pages, I will bring to light a number of linguistic factors which condition mood selection in oral and written data from the present intergenerational sample of speakers.

Chapter Five suggests that the evidence at hand, both quantitative and qualitative, points to some minor differences in the discourse delivered by speakers of first, second, and third generation backgrounds with respect to mood and hypotheticality. I will highlight that a more variable and somewhat simplified system of subjunctive usage has developed among second and third generation Miami Cuban Spanish speakers. However, the grammatical forms, semantic values and pragmatic functions related to mood and hypotheticality mirror those of first generation speakers, suggesting that mood distinction is amply maintained among the successive generations of speakers included in this study.

Section one of this chapter reveals the quantitative findings made in the analysis of the present oral and written data corpus. Section two qualitatively considers these findings and relates the present study of Miami Cuban Spanish to previous studies of other Spanish language varieties and theoretical notions of Spanish mood selection in general.
Findings

1. Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative findings respective to each category of analysis included in this study (described in the previous chapter and shown in Figure 5) are reported separately. For this reason, research questions 1 and 2, restated below, are considered simultaneously as each category of analysis is visited. Quantitative analyses of the oral and written data for each category of analysis are described in the respective subsections which follow. Analysis of the 31-item written sentence completion task completed by those second and third generation speakers (N=13) enrolled in a Level I Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) course supports the patterns and tendencies revealed in the oral data analysis. Interestingly, however, subjunctive/indicative usage in written discourse was more variable than in spoken discourse. In the findings for each category, I will point out cases where differences between oral and written usage were apparent. In the findings reported here, only the independent factor 'generation' is included; the factor 'gender' yielded no statistically significant differences, and the factor 'birthplace' correlated too highly with 'generation' to be considered separately.

*Research question 1: How does the use of the subjunctive in distinct linguistic contexts compare across the three generations of speakers?*

*Research question 2: In categorical and variable contexts where the subjunctive does not appear, what verb forms replace it?*

1.1 Categorical contexts of usage. Quantitative analysis of the oral data revealed that in categorical contexts (volition, purpose, temporal with futurity, hypothetical manner), there were few intergenerational differences in the frequency of subjunctive usage. Table 1, below, displays the raw frequencies of subjunctive and indicative forms in speech across the three generations of speakers (Groups 1, 2, 3)
according to each context of usage. We can observe that the subjunctive was dominant across the three groups.

**Table 1**

Frequency of subjunctive and indicative forms in oral interview  
Categorical contexts of usage by speaker generation  
(N=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>33 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>61 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PURPOSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>1(3%)</td>
<td>33 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEMPORAL WITH FUTURITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HYPOTHETICAL MANNER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORICAL CONTEXT**

1.1.1 Volitional clauses. In volitional contexts, the subjunctive was always used by first generation speakers. In the Group 2 data, there were four occurrences of the indicative out of a total of 37 tokens of this semantic context, meaning that the indicative was used in 11% of cases among second generation speakers. Of 75 cases in the speech of Group 3 speakers, an indicative form was used in 14 (19%). Tests of One-way Analysis of Variance and Post-hoc Scheffé Analysis revealed no significant between-group differences, however.

Although the indicative was rarely observed in the category of volition in the oral data (11% among Group 2; 19% among Group 3), its usage was higher in the writing of the present subsample of Spanish
for Native Speakers (SNS) students (N=13). Item 19 (Mis padres siempre esperaban que yo...) and item 31 (Toda mi vida yo he esperado que...) reflected substantial frequencies of indicative usage (31% and 38%, respectively). The indicative was used by speakers C2, A3, C3 and Y3 in item 19 and by speakers A2, S2, A3, Y3, and S3 in item 31. The remaining SNS students used an accurate form of the subjunctive in items 19 and 31. These data are displayed in Table 1A, below.

**Table 1A**

Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in volitional clauses in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)

*Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases. Percentages are cumulative.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 5 'querer que'</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 8 'querer que'</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>11 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 19 'esperar que'</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>9 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 31 'esperar que'</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, in both of the items (19 and 31) containing the matrix clause esperar que, the indicative was more likely to be used by the present subsample than in item 5 (Mis padres siempre han querido que yo...) and item 8 (Yo quiero que mis hijos...), both containing the matrix clause querer que. For item 5, 17% (speakers A3 and E3) used the indicative, and for item 8, 15% (speakers S3 and Y3) employed an indicative form. This evidence might suggest that the present speakers semantically associate the verb querer more obligatorily with subjunctive usage than the verb esperar, perhaps because they view the latter as being less assertive than the former. Variability in volitional
contexts will be considered in some detail in the qualitative findings (section 2).

1.1.2 Purpose clauses. In purpose clauses, the subjunctive was replaced by the indicative on only one occasion by a third generation speaker (E3); the subjunctive was employed by the first and second generation in 100% of the cases and in 97% of the cases by the third generation. This difference was not statistically significant.

In the written data, the percentage of indicative usage in purpose clauses was 17%. Two of the twelve students (S3 and Y3) who responded to item 2 (‘Los inmigrantes hispanos en los Estados Unidos deben aprender inglés para que...’) used an indicative form. One speaker (A2) used an infinitive for this written item (in speech, there was no use of infinitives in purpose clauses by any speaker). The remaining 9 speakers (including E3, to whom one token of the indicative in a purpose clause was attributed in the oral data) responded with an accurate form of the present subjunctive (75%). Table 1B displays these data.

Table 1B
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in purpose clauses in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)
Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases Percentages are cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 2 ‘para que’</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3 Temporal clauses with futurity. In the oral data, the subjunctive was always used (100%) by all speakers of the present sample in subordinate temporal clauses with a future time reference. In the
written data, however, it was sometimes replaced by the indicative. Table 1C shows that in the sentence completion task, the overall preference for subjunctive was observed among second and third generation speakers, but indicative forms were used in some cases.

**Table 1C**

Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in temporal clauses with futurity in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)

*Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases
Percentages are cumulative*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEMPORAL WITH FUTURITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 26 'cuando'</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 27 'tan pronto como'</td>
<td>3 (38%)</td>
<td>5 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 28 'cuando'</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>11 (85%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to item 26 (*Me iré de vacaciones cuando...*), three of the thirteen speakers (E3, S3 and Y3) used an indicative form. The remaining ten used an accurate form of the present subjunctive. For item 27 (*Voy a comprar un carro nuevo tan pronto como...*), 38% (3/8) of total responses (speakers A3, C3, and Y3) employed the present indicative; the remaining five who responded used the present subjunctive. And for item 28 (*Compraré una casa cuando...*), 15% (2/13) of sentences were written using the indicative—speaker A3 used a future indicative form (*me casaré*) and speaker Y3 used a present indicative form (*tengo dinero para comprarlo*).

1.1.4 Hypothetical manner clauses. In the oral data, the subjunctive was always used (100%) by all speakers of the present sample in hypothetical manner clauses (*como si...*). No examples of hypothetical manner were included in the written sentence completion task, and
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indeed its occurrence was rare in the speech of all three groups of speakers constituting the present analysis (5 tokens in Group 1 data, 5 tokens in Group 2 data, 4 tokens in Group 3 data, as seen in Table 1). Its rare occurrence in natural discourse and the very limited number of tokens included in this analysis make it difficult to make any firm conclusions about the categorical usage of the subjunctive in hypothetical manner clauses. The data we have, however, suggest that these clauses occur with similar frequency in the speech of all three generations, and always include the subjunctive.

1.2 Variable contexts of usage. The frequency of the subjunctive was substantially reduced in the speech of second and third generation speakers in variable categories of usage (comment, concessive, possibility, uncertainty, negated causative, adjective, depende de, no sé si). Table 2 displays the raw frequencies of subjunctive and indicative forms in speech across the three generations (Groups 1, 2, 3) according to each context of usage.
Table 2
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative forms in oral interview
Variable contexts of usage by speaker generation
(N=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>29 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>13 (48%)*</td>
<td>14 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCESSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>13 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>25 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>18 (64%)*</td>
<td>10 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSIBILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>12 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>13 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>13 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>16 (48%)</td>
<td>17 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>21 (66%)*</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATED CAUSATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>9 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>42 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>22 (24%)</td>
<td>68 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>33 (43%)*</td>
<td>43 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'DEPENDE DE'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'NOS&amp;SÍ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, *p < .05

1.2.1 Comment clauses. In comment clauses, subjunctive usage decreased from 100% among Group 1 to 52% among Group 3, while little difference was evidenced between Group 1 and Group 2. In comment clauses where the subjunctive did not appear, it was always
replaced by a past (imperfect) or present form of the indicative. Table 2A reflects that there was a statistically significant difference (p<.05) among the three groups in the frequency of indicative usage in comment clauses where the subjunctive could also have appeared. Post hoc Scheffé tests revealed that the significance occurred between groups 1 (first generation) and 3 (third generation). It is noteworthy that none of the ten first-generation speakers ever used an indicative form in a comment clause (Maximum=0).

**Table 2A**

Results of One-way Analysis of Variance

Frequency of the indicative in comment clauses in oral interview by speaker generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.2667</td>
<td>4.6333</td>
<td>4.7748</td>
<td>.0168 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.2000</td>
<td>.9704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.4667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3000</td>
<td>.6749</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
<td>1.5670</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.5333</td>
<td>1.1059</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

In the written sentence completion task, responses to items 1, 3, 7, 12, and 13 reflected the majority's preference for the indicative in comment clauses (see Table 2B). In response to item 1 (*Pienso que es bueno que los hispanos en Estados Unidos...*), nine out of twelve total responses (75%) included an indicative form. Speakers I2 (*han llegado a lograr un puesto tan alto en la sociedad*), A3 (*se han establecido como*...*)
una clase con influencia) and C3 (han mantenido su cultura) used an accurate form of the present perfect indicative in their responses, while speakers A2, E3, O3, and S3 used a simple present indicative form. Two others, D3 (están empezando a ser más reconocidos por su mobiliad (sic) en la sociedad) and Y3 (están adelantando tanto), used an accurate form of the present progressive indicative. The remaining three SNS students who responded (25%) accurately used the simple present subjunctive in their responses (C2, S2, and T2).

For item 3 (Es útil ser bilingüe en Miami, no importa donde...), eight of thirteen respondents (62%) used an indicative form. Of those eight, six speakers (A2, C2, S2, T2, A3, and S3) used a simple present indicative form and two speakers (E3 and Y3) completed the sentence with the preterite indicative, naciste. The remaining five students (I2, C3, D3, G3, and O3) who responded (38%) used an accurate form of the present subjunctive.

Table 2B
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in comment clauses in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)
Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases
Percentages are cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 1 'es bueno que'</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 3 'no importa donde'</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 7 'me alegro de que'</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 9 'es importante que'</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 11 'es mejor que'</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 12 'me gusta que'</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 13 'no me gusta que'</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 15 'es necesaria que'</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All but one student (92%) responded in the indicative to item 7 (Ahora me alegro de que yo...). Nine speakers (C2, I2, S2, T2, C3, E3, O3, S3, and Y3) used an accurate form of the simple present indicative. Two other speakers, A2 and A3, used the preterite indicative forms aprendí and decidí, respectively. The only respondent who used the present subjunctive was G3, who completed the sentence with estudie tanto. The lexical emphasis on non-futurity may have had some implication in the overwhelming preference for indicative in response to item 7, a suggestion to be developed in the qualitative analysis.

Item 12 (En Miami, me gusta que...) and item 13 (En Miami, no me gusta que...) both reflected speaker preference for the indicative. For item 12, ten of twelve respondents (83%) used the simple present indicative. The remaining two (D3, las personas bilingües se puedan expresar (sic) and S2, haiga diferentes culturas) used the present subjunctive (17%). In response to item 13, usage of the present subjunctive increased to 33% (4/12), attributed to speakers I2, T2, C3, and D3. The remaining eight SNS students who completed item 13 used an accurate form of the simple present indicative.

In completing the remaining three items classified under the comment category (9, 11, 15), most speakers used the subjunctive. It is interesting to note that while these were the only comment items in which the subjunctive forms prevailed, they were also the only sentences which began with subjunctive "trigger" phrases (Es importante que..., Es mejor que..., Es necesario que...).

For item 9 (Es importante que los niños...), 77% (10/13) of the responses were written in the present subjunctive. The remaining three speakers (A3, E3 and Y3) used the simple present indicative. For item 11 (Es mejor que los niños bilingües en Estados Unidos...), speakers A3 (saben utilizar los dos idiomas) and Y3 (usan la segunda lengua lo más posible) again responded in the simple present
indicative. They were the only two SNS students who responded to this item in the indicative, out of eleven total. The remaining 82% (9/11) used an accurate form of the present subjunctive (speakers A2, I2, S2, T2, C3, D3, E3, G3, S3). For item 15 (Es necesario que los políticos en Estados Unidos...), 62% (8/13) responded using an accurate form of the subjunctive. The remaining 38% (5/13) used the simple present indicative (speakers A3, D3, E3, S3, Y3).

1.2.2 Concessive clauses. In concessive clauses in the oral data, subjunctive usage was quite similar among the first and second generations (76% and 78%, respectively) but diminished dramatically among Group 3 speakers (36%). This difference was not appreciable enough to yield statistical significance in One-way Analysis of Variance, however, probably because of the small number of speakers included in this analysis.

In the written data, the concessive clause posed in item 23 (Voy a terminar mi carrera universitaria aunque...) was completed with an accurate form of the present subjunctive in 67% (8/12) of cases (Table 2C). Four other speakers (A3, C3, S3 and Y3) used a simple present indicative form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONCESSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 23 'aunque'</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2C
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in concessive clauses in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)
Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases
Percentages are cumulative
The tendency to use the indicative in concessive clauses in oral discourse was also observed in the Group 3 data. Speaker A3, who used the indicative in response to written item 23, produced the indicative in 9/9 concessive clauses during her oral interview. Speaker S3, on the other hand, accurately used the subjunctive in 2/2 concessive clauses during her oral interview, although she did not use the subjunctive in the completion of written item 23. It is noteworthy that all five of the second generation SNS students (A2, C2, I2, S2, T2) who completed the written sentence completion task used the present subjunctive to complete item 23, a preference also observed in the Group 2 oral data (78% subjunctive usage in concessive clauses, Table 1).

1.2.3 Possibility clauses. Possibility clauses reflected a pattern similar to concessive clauses. In these clauses, Groups 1 and 2 demonstrated preference for subjunctive usage (71% and 81%, respectively), while Group 3 speakers preferred the indicative in most cases (60%). Again, however, this difference was not statistically significant.

In written responses to item 29 of the sentence completion task (De viejo/a, es posible que yo...) the subjunctive was the overwhelming preference (91%) of the subsample (N=13) of second and third generation speakers. Only one speaker (A3) used the present indicative in a periphrastic construction (voy a viajar) to complete item 29. Table 2D displays these data.
1.2.4 Uncertainty clauses. The category 'uncertainty' reflected a consistent increase in usage of the indicative in the oral data across the three groups (24% for Group 1, 48% for Group 2, 66% for Group 3). In One-way Analysis of Variance, these between-group differences approached statistical significance (p=.06). The results of this statistical analysis are displayed in Table 2E, below.

Table 2E
Results of One-way Analysis of Variance
Frequency of the indicative in uncertainty clauses in oral interview by speaker generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.2667</td>
<td>7.6333</td>
<td>3.0443</td>
<td>.0642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.7000</td>
<td>2.5074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.9667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.5164</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
<td>2.2706</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1000</td>
<td>1.4491</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.3667</td>
<td>1.6914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subjunctive/indicative variability in the category of uncertainty reflected similar patterns in the oral and written data. In the speech of second generation speakers, subjunctive was very slightly preferred in this context (52%), and among third generation speakers, indicative was mostly used in oral discourse in this context (66%). This tendency is also evident in the written data. For item 10 (No creo que las escuelas en los Estados Unidos...), 100% (12/12) of the responses included the present indicative. For item 20 (De niño/a, yo dudaba que...), the imperfect indicative was used in 73% (8/11) of responses. Only one speaker (G3) used the past subjunctive to complete item 20. The remaining two speakers, S2 and T2, used the conditional indicative in their responses (mis padres seguirían juntos, and yo me quedaría en la escuela tanto tiempo, respectively). Responses to item 25 (Después de graduarme de la Universidad, dudo que...) were more variable. The present subjunctive was used in 42% (5/12) of responses, while the present indicative was used by five other speakers (S2, A3, C3, S3, Y3) and the future indicative was used by speaker O3 (me quedaré sin trabajo). The twelfth speaker (T2) who completed item 25 used the conditional indicative (regresaría y daría donaciones de 'alumni'). Table 2F displays the data for uncertainty clauses included in the written task.
Table 2F
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in uncertainty clauses in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)
Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases Percentages are cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 10 'no creer que'</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 20 'dudar que'</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 25 'dudar que'</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.5 Negated causative clauses. Negated causatives were mostly followed by the subjunctive in the speech of first and second generation speakers (83% and 53%, respectively), but third generation speakers' usage in oral discourse reflected a slight preference for the indicative (58%). These between-group differences were not statistically significant. The patterns of variation demonstrated by second and third generation speakers are quite similar, however, and the number of tokens for this category (Table 2) seems too small to suggest that the third generation employs subjunctive forms to a substantially lesser degree than the second generation. Moreover, out of the six tokens found in first generation speech, one was in the indicative. As such, it is difficult to suggest that mood distinction in this discourse category is appreciably more variable among successive generations, although this tendency does seem evident. No items representing this category were included in the written task.

1.2.6 Adjectival clauses. A significantly greater usage of the indicative in adjectival clauses was observed among second and third generation
speakers in comparison with the first generation. Table 2G shows that One-way Analysis of Variance revealed significant differences (p<.05). A Post hoc Scheffé analysis revealed that the significance occurred between Group 1 and Group 3.

### Table 2G
Results of One-way Analysis of Variance

Frequency of the indicative in adjectival clauses in oral interview by speaker generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.8667</td>
<td>21.4333</td>
<td>4.6632</td>
<td>.0182 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>124.1000</td>
<td>4.5963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>166.9667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.9661</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
<td>1.7512</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3000</td>
<td>3.1287</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.9667</td>
<td>2.3995</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

It is interesting to observe that within all three groups (Table 2G), there were some speakers who never used the indicative in variable adjectival contexts (Minimum=0), and within the first generation there were also some speakers who used the indicative in such contexts (Maximum=3). By far, however, the third generation reflected the greatest degree of indicative usage in adjectival clauses (Maximum=6 for generation two; Maximum=10 for generation 3, as seen in Table 2G).

In the adjectival context presented in item 17 of the written sentence completion task (El mejor presidente es el que...), the
indicate was preferred by most second and third generation speakers of the present subsample (9/13), while only four of the thirteen speakers (I2, S2, O3, Y3) used the present subjunctive. On the other hand, the majority of SNS students (8/13) preferred to use the subjunctive for item 24 (En el futuro quiero un trabajo que...). Five of the thirteen speakers (A2, T2, A3, D3, Y3) responding to this item used the present indicative. Table 2H displays these data.

Table 2H
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in adjectival clauses
in written task
completed by SNS students (N=13)
Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases
Percentages are cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 17</td>
<td>9 (69%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'El mejor presidente es el que...'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 24</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'En el futuro quiero un trabajo que...'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greater usage of subjunctive among the present subsample in response to item 24 of the written task could perhaps be attributed to its added lexical emphasis on futurity (En el futuro...), a semantic dimension which is lacking in item 17. The importance of the semantic value [+FUTURE] will be brought to light in the qualitative analysis (section 2).

1.2.7 Dependencia and No sé si clauses. Like negated causatives, tokens of depende de and no sé si constructions in the oral interview data
were very few. Given their small numbers, it seems unsafe to make any assumptions about between-group variation in this category. Based on the limited evidence we have, however, it appears that indicative forms are mostly preferred by third generation speakers in both of these contexts, while first and second generation speakers prefer the subjunctive (Table 2).

None of the thirteen SNS students completing item 22 of the written task (Para el futuro no sé si...) used the subjunctive. One speaker (O3) used the conditional indicative to complete this sentence (me quedaría en Miami) and two others, S2 and T2, used future indicative forms (ganaré mucho dinero, and me quedaré en Miami, respectively). The remaining eight speakers who responded to item 22 used simple present indicative forms (see Table 2I). There were no depende de constructions included in the written task.

Table 2I

Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in no sé si clauses in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)

Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases
Percentages are cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No sé si</td>
<td>10 (91%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Hypothetical discourse contexts. The three categories protasis, apodosis, and modal constitute hypothetical discourse. In non-contact varieties of modern-day Spanish, conditional indicative forms are predominantly found in apodoses and modal expressions, while past subjunctive forms appear in most protases. This normative pattern
Findings

was reflected in the speech of all three generations comprising the present sample. Table 3 displays the oral interview data for these three categories of analysis.

1.3.1 Protasis. In protases in the oral interview data, indicative forms were never used by first generation speakers. All 22 protases observed in Group 1 speech contained the past subjunctive (100%). The percentage of subjunctive usage was less prevalent in Group 2 and Group 3 oral discourse. For second generation speakers, the past subjunctive was used in 65% (30/46) of protases, and the imperfect indicative and the conditional indicative were used in 28% (13/46) and 6% (3/46) of cases, respectively. The pattern reflected in second-generation speech was quite similar to that of third-generation speech. Past subjunctive forms appeared in 70% (42/60) of protases produced by Group 3, while the imperfect indicative and the conditional indicative appeared in 23% (14/60) and 7% (4/60) of cases, respectively. None of these between-group differences in the oral data were statistically significant.
### Table 3
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative forms in oral interview
Hypothetical discourse contexts of usage by speaker generation
(N=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROTASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL 0</td>
<td>IMPERFECT 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
<td>30 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APODESIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL 9 (64%)</td>
<td>IMPERFECT 3 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
<td>15 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>10 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL 47 (81%)</td>
<td>IMPERFECT 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>124 (55%)</td>
<td>36 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>99 (59%)</td>
<td>16 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 (19%)</td>
<td>65 (29%)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

### Hypothetical Discourse

In protases in the written sentence completion task (items 4, 14, 16), there was high variability among the imperfect indicative and past subjunctive forms (see Table 3A). In response to item 4 (Hablaria más español en mi vida diaria si...), 38% of students (5/13) used an accurate form of the past subjunctive (speakers I2, T2, D3, G3, O3). The imperfect indicative was used in 46% of responses (6/13), written by speakers A2, A3, C3, E3, S3, and Y3. Only one speaker, S2, used the conditional indicative (mis amistades hablan más) to complete item 4. Speaker C2 used a present indicative form (lo hablo un poco mejor) in response to this item.

In item 14 (Yo me mudaría de Miami si...) none of the students used conditional forms (Table 3A). Two of the thirteen (A3, era necesario para mi familia o mi trabajo and S3, tenía el dinero) responded using an imperfect indicative form (15%) and six (46%)
responded using the prescribed past subjunctive (speakers A2, I2, T2, C3, E3, Y3). The remaining five students responded using a variety of other forms. Three (23%) used the present indicative in their responses (speakers S2, D3 and G3). One responded in the preterite indicative (C2, encontré un trabajo en otra ciudad), and another used a present subjunctive form in his response (O3, se libere Cuba).

Item 16 (Yo votaría por una mujer para la presidencia si...), also protasis, reflected a similar variable pattern (see Table 3A). Of thirteen total responses, four students (speakers A2, A3, S3, and Y3), used the imperfect indicative (31%). Four others (speakers D3, G3, I2, and T2) used a form of the normative past subjunctive (31%). Of the remaining five, four (speakers C2, S2, O3, and E3) used the present indicative (30%) and one (speaker C3) used the preterite indicative (ella apoyó los derechos de las minorías del país).

**Table 3A**

Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in protasis and apodosis in written task completed by SNS students (N=13)

*Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases  
Percentages are cumulative*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apodosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>5 (46%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2 Apodosis. Verb usage in apodoses in the oral interview data was highly variable among speakers of all three generations, though none
of the differences showed statistical significance. Table 3 shows that the conditional indicative was preferred by Group 1 speakers (64%), while Group 2 speakers used this form in 27% of cases and Group 3 used it in 44% of cases. In 40% of cases, second generation speakers employed the imperfect indicative in apodoses and Group 1 and Group 3 speakers employed it in 21% and 13% of apodoses, respectively. Usage of the past subjunctive forms in apodoses was consistently higher among successive generations. While only 14% (2/14) of apodoses contained the past subjunctive in first-generation speech, second-generation speech evidenced this form in 32% (12/37) of cases and third-generation speakers used it in 44% (10/23) of cases. It is important to note that the number of tokens for this category is somewhat limited in the oral data, meaning that any conclusions with respect to past subjunctive usage in apodoses would be very tentative.

Analysis of the written data taken from a subsample of Group 2 and 3 speakers suggests that conditional indicative forms in apodoses were preferred by successive generations. Table 3A (above) reflects that in 46% of apodoses (5/11) written in response to item 18 (Si fuera presidente/a de la nación, yo...), an accurate form of the conditional indicative was used (speakers I2, S2, C3, Y3, and O3). The past subjunctive was used in 36% of such cases (4/11) by speakers A2, T2, A3 and D3. In the remaining 18% the present indicative was used (2/11) by speakers E3 (quiero igualdad (sic) para todos) and S3 (despido todos los políticos que no trabajan por la gente).

1.3.3 Modal contexts. Out of 58 tokens of modal usage found in first-generation speech, the imperfect indicative never appeared (Table 3). This form did appear, however, in 16% (36/225) of modal contexts in second-generation oral discourse, and in 10% (16/168) of such cases in third-generation oral discourse. For all three groups, the verb form of
preference in this context was the conditional indicative (81% for Group 1, 55% for Group 2, 59% for Group 3), in keeping with modern-day normative Spanish.

Table 3B shows that in modal contexts where the conditional indicative forms would be expected in normative Spanish, the past subjunctive forms were variably used to a significantly different degree (p<.01) across the three groups of speakers. A Post hoc Scheffé analysis revealed that the significance occurred between Group 1 and Group 2. It is interesting that in this case the second generation, rather than the third, reflected the greatest degree of variation when compared with the first generation; the mean for Group 1 was 1.1 while the means for Group 2 and Group 3 were 6.5 and 5.3, respectively. Table 3B reflects these values.

Table 3B
Results of One-way Analysis of Variance
Frequency of the subjunctive (past) in modal contexts in oral interview by speaker generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.8000</td>
<td>80.4000</td>
<td>5.8433</td>
<td>.0078 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>371.5000</td>
<td>13.7593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>532.3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Standard Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
<td>1.4491</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5000</td>
<td>4.2230</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>13.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3000</td>
<td>4.6200</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>13.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
<td>4.2843</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>13.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
The expansion of the past subjunctive in modal expressions in second and third-generation speech will be considered in the qualitative findings highlighted in this chapter (section 2).

1.4 **Idiomatic usage of the subjunctive.** Idiomatic usage of the subjunctive reflected strikingly similar frequencies among first and second generation speakers (35 and 36, respectively). For Group 3, however, idiomatic usage of the subjunctive declined dramatically. The value '66' reflected for Group 3 in Table 4 (below) is mostly owed to a single speaker (O3) whose one-hour interview evidenced 61 tokens of the idiomatic subjunctive (in all cases, *vaya*). The greatly reduced usage of the idiomatic subjunctive by most third generation speakers impressionistically could be viewed as characteristic of a lesser degree of proficiency or fluency in the language. However, it seems important to divorce semantically unmeaningful elements of speech from meaningful ones, i.e. the basic verb system, in the empirical considerations which most concern us here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDIOMATIC USAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 **Affirmative clauses.** Items 6, 21, and 30 of the written sentence completion task comprised the affirmative category. The affirmative category was excluded from the oral data analysis since tokens of the affirmative subjunctive in the oral data corpus were extremely few. In
the written sentence completion task, the indicative would categorically be expected for item 6 (Cuando era niño/a creía que...). For items 21 (Ahora sé que yo...) and 30 (De viejo/a, es seguro que yo...), the indicative or the subjunctive could variably be used according to the discourse context.

Most written responses to these items provided by the subsample of second and third generation speakers (N=13) included indicative forms. Only one speaker (C2) inappropriately used the present subjunctive in response to item 6 (que Santa Claus exista). The remaining majority of respondents (92%) used an accurate form of the imperfect indicative. For item 21, all of the respondents (12/12) used an appropriate form of the indicative. In response to item 30, 25% (3/12) of sentences written by the present subsample included subjunctive forms (speakers S2, D3, O3). Of the remaining 75% (9/12), eight speakers (A2, C2, I2, A3, C3, E3, S3, Y3) used the periphrastic indicative construction voy a... and one speaker (T2) used a simple future indicative form (me retiraré con mucho dinero). Table 5 displays these data.

Table 5
Frequency of subjunctive and indicative in affirmative clauses
in written task
completed by SNS students (N=13)
Total item frequencies not equal to 13 indicate use of other verb forms or missing cases
Percentages are cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT OF USAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF INDICATIVE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFIRMATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 6 'creer que'</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 21 'sé que'</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 30 'es seguro que'</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question 3: How might the use of a different verb form semantically and pragmatically affect the meaning of the utterance?

Response to Research question 3, stated above, leads to the qualitative data analysis developed in section 2 of this chapter. Before turning to section 2, I wish to point out briefly that the qualitative analysis carried out suggests that the conveyance of semantic meaning, in the vast majority of cases, was not altered by the use of an indicative form instead of a subjunctive form in the discourse of the present sample. Semantic meaning did not seem affected by the use of a subjunctive form instead of a conditional indicative form in modal main clauses either. As will be brought to light by the qualitative analysis discussed below, the indicative normally occurred in the discourse of successive generations in variable contexts where specific semantic values were applicable. These semantic values will be identified and carefully considered in the pages which follow.

The use of indicative forms in comment clauses, adjectival clauses, and uncertainty clauses in argumentative discourse did appear to alter somewhat the pragmatic meaning of the utterances conveyed, however. These differences, along with the importance of semantic factors, will be considered in the qualitative considerations made in the remaining pages of this chapter.
2. Qualitative analysis

It is interesting to note that those categories of usage which reflect significant between-group differences are variable contexts of usage in modern-day non-contact varieties of Spanish, as explained in Chapter Two. In both adjectival and comment clauses, the indicative may appear variably with the subjunctive according to the discourse context. In modal contexts, the past subjunctive may vary with conditional indicative forms in many modern-day varieties of Spanish (Nazario 1972, Lope Blanch 1991, DeMello 1993, Gutiérrez 1996), as it has throughout the evolution of the Spanish language (Rojo 1986).

In the present analysis, I will establish that the higher variability of mood found in second and third generation speech is mostly the result of the semantic values which speakers associate with certain contexts of usage. In contexts where the semantic values [+IRREALIS] and/or [+FUTURE] are clearly associated, all speakers preferred the subjunctive forms. In contexts which could be considered [-IRREALIS] and/or [-FUTURE], first and second generation speakers used the subjunctive and indicative variably, while most third generation speakers preferred the indicative in many cases.

Following this notion, I seek to demonstrate that second and third generation speakers of the present sample associate with the subjunctive the same semantic values as first generation speakers. That is, second and third generation discourse reflects that all use the subjunctive in contexts characterized by either of the values [+IRREALIS] and/or [+FUTURE]. This notion would explain why successive generations' usage of the subjunctive forms in the contexts of volition [+FUTURE], purpose [+FUTURE], temporal with futurity [+FUTURE], and hypothetical manner [+IRREALIS] was not very
different to that of the first generation. For those semantic categories considered variable, in cases where [+IRREALIS] or [+FUTURE] are inapplicable, the frequency of the indicative was greater in the discourse of successive generations.

This section will concentrate on the categories of usage in which significant between-group differences in the frequency of usage were found. In section 2.2, variability in adjectival clauses will be explained; in section 2.3, variability in comment clauses is highlighted; and in section 2.4, modal usage is considered. In addition, I will highlight in section 2.5 indicative usage in contexts of uncertainty, a category which approached statistical significance for between-group differences in the frequency of usage. In section 2.6, I will consider verb usage in volitional clauses, the only categorical context of usage where subjunctive/indicative variability occurred.

Prior to these considerations, however, I believe it may be insightful to consider individual usage (oral and written) among the second and third generation speakers for each one of these categories (adjective, comment, modal usage, uncertainty, and volitional). In our considerations of individual usage in section 2.1, following, it will become apparent that the high variability observed among successive generations was not attributable to every speaker; some individuals demonstrated highly normative usage of the subjunctive.

2.1 Individual usage. Charts 1 and 2 display individual second and third generation data for the four categories of usage where the greatest between-group differences were observed in statistical analysis: adjective (ADJ), comment (COM), modal (MOD), and uncertainty (UCT). Volition (VOL) was also included, since it was the only categorical context of usage where mood variability was observed in the present data.
Findings

We can observe in Chart 1 (Verb Usage of Second Generation Speakers) that in the categories of adjective, comment, uncertainty, and volition, five of the ten speakers (L2, T2, H2, S2, N2) comprising the second generation sample demonstrated highly normative spoken usage of the subjunctive forms, and in modal contexts, the conditional forms. Speaker I2's spoken usage was also highly normative, except for the lack of the present perfect subjunctive in two tokens found in comment clauses, which she replaced with the present perfect indicative (Example 31, section 2.3). The remaining four second generation speakers (A2, R2, C2, J2) all used the subjunctive forms variably with the indicative forms in speech, and in modal contexts, the conditional was sometimes replaced by the past subjunctive or the imperfect indicative.

We can also observe in Chart 1 that the writing of those five second generation speakers enrolled in a Spanish for Native Speakers course (A2, T2, C2, I2, S2) reflected a generally higher degree of mood variability than their speech. For example, T2's speech reflected highly normative usage of the subjunctive in adjectival contexts, while in his writing only the indicative was used in items 17 and 24 of the sentence completion task. Similarly, A2 always used the subjunctive in volitional clauses in oral discourse, but in the written task, the indicative was variably used. Speaker C2 used the subjunctive forms normatively in comment clauses in speech, but in writing he often replaced them with the indicative.

A similar pattern was revealed in the third generation individual data. Chart 2 reflects that speaker C3 used the subjunctive normatively in volitional contexts in oral discourse, yet in completion of the written task, she used the subjunctive in three contexts where it was expected (items 5, 8, 31) and the indicative in the fourth (item 19). In adjectival clauses in oral discourse, speakers D3 and G3 used the
### Chart 1: VERB USAGE OF SECOND GENERATION SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>j2</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>N2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S-perf</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>S-/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **S+**: Subjunctive forms are used in all cases where possible in oral discourse.
- **S+/wr**: Subjunctive forms are used in all cases where possible in writing.
- **S-perf**: Subjunctive forms are used in all cases where possible in oral discourse, but with reduction of the perfect tenses.
- **Svar**: Subjunctive forms are used but vary substantially with indicative forms in oral discourse.
- **Svar/wr**: Subjunctive forms are used but vary substantially with indicative forms in writing.
- **S-**: Subjunctive forms are used only in some cases in oral discourse; indicative forms preferred.
- **S-/wr**: Subjunctive forms are used only in some cases in writing; indicative forms preferred.
- **I**: Only indicative forms are used in oral discourse.
- **I/wr**: Only indicative forms are used in writing.
- **C**: Conditional indicative forms are used in most cases where possible in oral discourse.
- **Cvar**: Conditional indicative forms are used but vary substantially with past subjunctive forms in oral discourse.
- **C-**: Conditional indicative forms are used in some cases in oral discourse; past subjunctive or imperfect indicative forms preferred.
- **nd**: No oral data.
- **n/wr**: No written data (the speaker did not complete the written task).
## Chart 2: VERB USAGE OF THIRD GENERATION SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>I3</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>O3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>S-/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>S-/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
<td>Cvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>n/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
<td>I/wr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>Svar/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
<td>S-/wr</td>
<td>S+/wr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **S+**: Subjunctive forms are used in all cases where possible in oral discourse.
- **S+/wr**: Subjunctive forms are used in all cases where possible in writing.
- **S-perf**: Subjunctive forms are used in all cases where possible in oral discourse, but with reduction of the perfect tenses.
- **Svar**: Subjunctive forms are used but vary substantially with indicative forms in oral discourse.
- **Svar/wr**: Subjunctive forms are used but vary substantially with indicative forms in writing.
- **S-**: Subjunctive forms are used only in some cases in oral discourse; indicative forms preferred.
- **S-/wr**: Subjunctive forms are used only in some cases in writing; indicative forms preferred.
- **I**: Only indicative forms are used in oral discourse.
- **I/wr**: Only indicative forms are used in writing.
- **C**: Conditional indicative forms are used in most cases where possible in oral discourse.
- **Cvar**: Conditional indicative forms are used but vary substantially with past subjunctive forms in oral discourse.
- **C-**: Conditional indicative forms are used in some cases in oral discourse; past subjunctive or imperfect indicative forms preferred.
- **nd**: No oral data.
- **n/wr**: No written data (the speaker did not complete the written task).
subjunctive normatively, but in the written task D3 only used the indicative in this context, and G3 varied the subjunctive with the indicative.

Chart 2 reflects that, overall, speakers D3, M3, G3, and O3 were highly proficient with respect to mood and hypotheticality in oral discourse. Their spoken usage of the subjunctive and conditional was, in the great majority of cases, normative by first generation standards. Only M3 reflected preference for the indicative in uncertainty clauses (but it is important to bear in mind that this context of usage is also highly variable in normative monolingual varieties of Spanish, as explained in Chapter Two). The remaining third generation speakers (C3, S3, Y3, I3, E3 and A3) reflected high variability in these five contexts of usage under scrutiny; to these six speakers we can probably attribute the statistically significant differences which were revealed in the quantitative analysis.

I will offer examples from the speech and writing of a number of the present speakers in the remaining pages of this chapter, as I explore the possible factors conditioning the high variability observed in their discourse. Throughout, I will relate the findings to a number of previous studies on mood variability in Spanish.

The following abbreviations will be used to identify verb forms in the examples found throughout the rest of this chapter: IND=present indicative (yo hablo or yo he hablado), PER IND=periphrastic future indicative (voy a hablar or voy a haber hablado), IMP IND=imperfect indicative (yo hablaba or yo había hablado), CON=conditional indicative (yo hablaría or yo habría hablado), SUB=present subjunctive (yo hable or yo haya hablado), PAST SUB=past subjunctive (yo hablara or yo hubiera hablado). For the identification of speakers, a '1' means the speaker is considered first generation, '2' refers to the second generation, and '3' means that the
speaker is classified as third generation (for example, 'A3' signifies the speaker whose first initial is 'A' from Group 3, third generation).

2.2 Variability in adjectival clauses. This subsection will explore mood variability in adjectival clauses in relation to two semantic factors: [±IRREALIS] and [±FUTURE]. I will attempt to establish that in adjectival contexts where either of the values [±IRREALIS] or [±FUTURE] is associated, the subjunctive is preferred among all of the present speakers, first, second, and third generation. Where opposite values apply, however, variation occurs.

Of the first generation speakers, only two (F1 and L1) variably used the indicative in an adjectival clause. The remaining first generation speakers consistently used the subjunctive in this context. Example 1 demonstrates speaker L1’s use of the indicative in an adjectival locative clause:

Example 1
L1 (talking about the concept of 'Miami culture'): Yo no sé si quepa hablar de una- de una cultura que haya una esencia a que- a la que se esté contribuyendo con eso o si quepa sólo hablar de un dinamismo continuo donde no hay (IND) una—Es un cambio constante que evita un asiento, así, el asiento de la cultura.

Example 2 reflects another semantic context of indicative usage in adjectival clauses observed in the speech of L1. In this example, she discusses what in her opinion is the basic social psychological difference between the "American" and the "Hispanic":

...
Example 2
L1: O sea, tú le pones a un norteamericano una flecha y él te la sigue aunque eso signifique suicidio. Y el hispano no te la sigue, aunque signifique lo mismo.... En tanto que el americano sí es- es más en ese sentido es más disciplinado. Pero entonces también tiene la tendencia a volverse ganado el americano. Allí a seguir siempre y sencillamente lo que todo el mundo hace (IND). Entonces yo creo que la respuesta del individualismo está entre las dos tendencias.

These two examples indicate at least two specific adjectival contexts in which first generation speakers accept use of the indicative—in locative clauses and in description of universal tendencies.

In the speech of the second generation, no locative clauses containing the indicative were identified. However, a few tokens of the locative adjectival context followed by subjunctive were found in the second generation data (as in the first generation data), and these came from the speech of only one speaker, I2. Examples 3 and 4 demonstrate I2's usage of the subjunctive in this context:

Example 3
A (researcher): ¿Piensas que Miami es una ciudad bilingüe?
I2: Sí, completamente. Todo. Hasta los carteles, I mean dondequiera que tú vayas (SUB), es bilingüe. La mayoría de la gente hablan inglés y español.

---

1 Examples such as this one (dondequiera que...) would be considered adverbials of place in a syntactic analysis. For the present purposes, however, I have included such tokens within the subcategory of locatives since their occurrence was so limited in the data and also since they may be considered adjectival in a broader semantic sense, describing the place under the speaker's consideration.
Example 4
I2: No me gustaría ir para un lugar donde nada más que hablaran (PAST SUB) inglés.... Me fascina mucho la música latina, el merengue, la salsa, y yo no creo que yo pudiera vivir donde no exista (SUB) esa música. Yo sólo voy a las discotecas latinas.

In the third generation data, the indicative was identified in all locative clauses, as in Examples 5-7:

Example 5
A (researcher): ¿A la persona que no sepa español en Miami, se le hace difícil la vida?
O3: Sí que se le hace difícil. Se le hace difícil porque yo, por ejemplo, a cualquier tienda que voy (IND), Winn Dixie o a la que sea, la gente van y lo primero que dicen es, you know, 'Hola. ¿En qué le puedo ayudar?' Te hablan primero en español. Y eso para la gente que no habla español- eso va a ser un- vaya, a rude awakening. Imagínate que en su propio país ni hablen su idioma.... Imagínate que dondequiera que va (IND)... todo es en español.

Example 6
A (researcher): ¿Piensas que Miami es en realidad una ciudad bilingüe?
D3: Sí, en el lugar que tú vas (IND) yo pienso que es bilingüe, porque si tú vas a una tienda y tú sabes que la persona habla español tú le puedes hablar en español.
Example 7
M3 (talking about her grandmother): Nunca en la vida ella entraría a un Sedano's porque allí va mucha gente latina. Ella quiere estar allí al lado de los americanos, donde casi no ve (IND) gente hispana.

Given the very limited number of tokens of locative clauses found in the speech of all three groups and the semantic similarity of all the examples, it seems impossible to ascertain any clear pattern of cross-generational variability. Based on the few examples we have, however, it appears that use of the indicative in adjectival clauses expressing location is no greater among successive generations than among the first generation.

In other types of adjectival clauses, however, differences in the patterns of usage between the three groups are more clearly apparent. Let us consider with respect to the semantic values [+IRREALIS] and [+FUTURE] the following examples (8-17) taken from some speakers of each generation:

Example 8
M1 (talking about education): En Cuba es casi imposible encontrarte a nadie que no tenga (SUB) aunque sea un high school. [+IRREALIS]

Example 9
Y1 (talking about the situation of formal Spanish in Miami): No existen discusiones académicas realmente que aporten (SUB) a la lengua española... No existen editoriales competentes de lengua española que publiquen (SUB), o sea, obras en español. [+IRREALIS]
**Example 10**

I1 (talking about the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal as of November, 1998): Yo te voy a decir una cosa, yo creo que el pueblo no acepta de que él se vaya. Es de plata, de dinero. Eso le produce a ella dinero, los libros que vaya a escribir (SUB) y todas esas cosas. Y todas las conferencias que vaya a dar (SUB) y todas esas cosas. [+FUTURE]

In the above three examples (8-10), all from the speech of Group 1, we can observe that first generation speakers use the subjunctive in describing nouns which may be characterized as [+IRREALIS] or [+FUTURE]. Second and third generation speakers of the present sample all appear to strictly follow this pattern as well. This norm can be observed in the following examples from speakers A2 (Example 11), T2 (Example 12), N2 (Example 13), and H2 (Example 14) of the second generation, and speakers G3 (Example 15), O3 (Example 16), and M3 (Example 17) of the third generation:

**Example 11**

A2: En este mundo no hay nadie que te pueda (SUB) decir qué puedes hacer o qué no puedes hacer, no más que Dios. Uno puede hacer cualquier cosa que quiera. [+IRREALIS]

**Example 12**

T2 (talking about his family's bakery): Los pasteles que vendemos- no es gourmet ni es nada que cueste (SUB) tan caro ni que sea (SUB) algo del otro mundo, so entonces es barato. [+IRREALIS]

**Example 13**

N2: Yo no conozco a nadie que- sabes, de mi edad- que no haya estudiado (SUB). [+IRREALIS]
Example 14
H2: No creo que las escuelas les estén dando a los niños eh suficiente—algo que les atraiga (SUB), tú sabes, que les haga (SUB) mantenerse en la escuela. Disciplina no hay en las escuelas realmente.... Pero tampoco hay algo que le inspire (SUB) al niño o al muchacho o a la persona ir a la escuela y realmente aprender. [+IRREALIS]

Example 15
G3 (talking about the possibility of living in the Northeast in the future): Bueno, no hay nada que no me guste (SUB), you know, because I mean los tiempos cambian y eso es bonito, que aquí no los hay. Pero yo no diría que hay- que hay nada que no me guste (SUB).... Pero no me iría porque- I don't know, me gusta Miami porque es aquí que me crecí. [+IRREALIS]

Example 16
O3 (talking about future political relations between Cuba and the U.S.): Estoy totalmente a favor de cualquier ley que le apriete (SUB) a Cuba y que le haga (SUB) más difícil a Castro apoderarse de dinero y de apoyo internacional. [+FUTURE]

Example 17
M3 (talking about her grandmother): A cualquier persona que vea (SUB), siempre va a tener un problema. [+FUTURE]

As such, we have established that in the adjective category for cases where the semantic values [+IRREALIS] or [+FUTURE] were applicable, speakers across all three generations categorically used the subjunctive forms. Where these semantic values were not applicable,
variable usage characterized speech, to the extent that between-group differences in the usage of the indicative was statistically significant. In these cases, the indicative forms were more frequently used in the speech of successive generations.

The tendency to use the indicative was observed in adjectival clauses in the expression of ideals, i.e. an ideal partner or the type of person who would be a good president for the country. The following paragraphs explain this variability.

Since the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal was at the forefront of national public opinion and in the news headlines in the fall of 1998, many speakers were asked their opinions about the matter. In conversation, many offered their ideas about the qualities and characteristics which a "good" president should possess. In the adjectival clauses found in their descriptions, mood varied substantially. The following examples (18-20), in which subjunctive/indicative variation may be observed, were taken from second generation discourse on the qualities of an ideal president:

Example 18
C2: Yo pienso que es una combinación de ser una persona que entienda (SUB) los problemas pero también que sepa (SUB) qué es lo que debe hacer, cómo ayudar a los Estados Unidos para salir adelante.

Example 19
A (researcher): ¿Cuáles son las cualidades de un buen presidente?
A2: Bueno, primero que sea (SUB) honesto, que sepa (SUB) lo que va a hacer y que haga (SUB) lo que sea mejor para el país, no lo que gente piensan que sea mayor, no lo que la gente quieran, pero lo que sea mejor para el país.
Example 20
R2: Tiene que ser una persona que- que sepa comunicar (SUB) bien, que entienda (SUB) su influencia, su poder. Como otros gobernadores y eso, que pueda representar (SUB) el país bien profesional, que sea (SUB) inteligente. Y creo que sobre todo, que trata (IND) de hacer lo que es mejor para el país americano, para los Estados Unidos.... Y de verdad una persona que es (IND) honesta allí y que quiere (IND) hacer lo mejor para la gente.

R2's description of the ideal president reflects the tendency to alternate between subjunctive and indicative usage, perhaps freely, in this semantic and discourse context. This tendency was observed in third generation speech as well, as in Examples 21-26:

Example 21
Y3: Es una persona moral con una familia. Es un hombre o mujer muy fuerte que tiene (IND) la humanidad, el interés, no sé.

Example 22
M3: Es una persona que, yo pienso, que ame (SUB)- que nada más que tenga (SUB) amor para las cosas, amor para sí mismo, amor para todas las otras cosas.... Yo creo que sería una persona que también- tendría que ser well-rounded, que sepa (SUB) un poco de todo.

Example 23
A3: Tiene que ser alguien ambicioso que sabe (IND) lo que necesita y que va a hacer (IND) lo que falta para coger eso. No alguien que, 'Ah sí, nosotros necesitamos esto, esto y esto, pero no sé cómo hacerlo.'
Example 24
C3: Yo creo que es alguien derecho, alguien que pueda (SUB) dirigir la economía y la educación y saber en dónde poner su dinero y en dónde no. Cosas así.

Example 25
D3: Tiene que ser un presidente que pueda (SUB) determinar lo que el pueblo necesite y no solamente diga (SUB) lo que los representantes que están detrás de él que están diciendo que diga, que no diga (SUB) tantas mentiras.

Example 26
O3: Un buen presidente necesita ser una persona que ha sacrificado (IND) por su país, en alguna forma u otra. En mi opinión un presidente definitivamente debe ser alguien que o bien ha servido (IND) en el militar o algo de eso, algún tipo de servicio disciplinado a su país. Y en mi opinión tiene que ser una persona que no tenga (SUB) esqueletos, vaya, en el closet. O por lo menos big skeletons, you know.

As previously observed in the quantitative findings, written responses to item 17 of the sentence completion task demonstrated that the present subsample of second and third generation speakers (N=13) preferred the indicative following *El mejor presidente es el que*.... On the other hand, the same speakers demonstrated preference for the subjunctive to complete item 24 (*En el futuro quiero un trabajo que*...). We may consider that the subjunctive mood is preferred in the context of the latter since futurity is clearly implicated. The differential behavior demonstrated by the present speakers in reponse to these two semantically very similar items would support the notion that the
subjunctive is the preferred form of use among successive generations in contexts where [+FUTURE] is clearly applicable. In contexts where it is not, the indicative is variably used.

To further elucidate this hypothesis, let us consider the oral interview responses given by speaker I2 (second generation), in Example 27, and by C3 (third generation), in Example 28, when asked to describe their ideal partner ("Describeme tu pareja ideal"):  

**Example 27**

I2: Todos los novios que yo he tenido no más que hablan español.... A mi mamá le molesta porque ella dice que yo tengo que buscarme a un-alguien que hable (SUB) inglés para americanizarme más.... (Pero) pienso casarme con alguien que hable (SUB) español. [+FUTURE]

**Example 28**

C3: Es una persona hispana que comparte (IND), que habla (IND) sobre su vida, que comparte (IND) con la familia de ellos, que la familia se junta (IND) y pasan (IND) el tiempo juntos. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS]

To most monolingual Spanish speakers, both of the descriptions offered by I2 (Example 27) and C3 (Example 28) are acceptable, irrespective of the mood used in either. As such, there is no syntactic or semantic constraint which would make the subjunctive necessary in such context. Semantically, however, the value of [+IRREALIS] seems affected by C3's use of the indicative. The person described by C3 appears to exist certainly in the real world; perhaps she even knows that person already. Her description could be characterized as [-FUTURE] and [-IRREALIS]. On the other hand, the person mentioned by I2, que hable español, represents an ideal individual about which the speaker speculates meeting or knowing at some point
in the future. Her description could be characterized as [+FUTURE] in this sense; hence the subjunctive is prompted.

What is the effect created by I2's use of the subjunctive in such context? Pragmatically, I2 may be perceived as less certain about the reality that she will indeed find the person she idealizes, while C3 does appear sure. Use of the indicative by C3 pragmatically could even create the impression that she would be unaccepting of a partner who does not possess the characteristics which she idealizes. On the other hand, I2 perhaps could be perceived as open to the possibility of becoming romantically involved with someone who does not speak Spanish after all. In either event, the utterances of both speakers are in keeping with normative modern-day Spanish.

2.3 Variability in comment clauses. The mood variation observed in comment clauses produced by second and third generation speakers further supports the hypothesis that where either of the semantic values [+FUTURE] or [+IRREALIS] was clearly implicated, speakers normally opted for the subjunctive. Since all comment clauses may be characterized as [+SUBJECTIVE], it is apparent that for many third generation speakers of the present sample this semantic value had little impact in their choice of mood in this context. For first generation speakers, however, clauses which were [+SUBJECTIVE] contained a subjunctive form in 100% of the cases, and for second generation speakers in 91% of the cases. As explained in Chapter Two, Lantolf (1978) discovered this same tendency in the speech of successive generations of Puerto Rican Spanish speakers in New York, and Blake (1981) found frequent usage of the indicative following Me alegro de que... among monolingual Spanish speakers in Mexico City.
Findings

In the first and second generation oral data of the present Miami Cuban Spanish speakers, tokens of the subjunctive were observed in subordinate clauses following such matrices as *me gusta que..., me gustaría que..., está bien que..., me molesta que..., le chocó que..., es importante que..., no/me importa que..., va a parecer ridículo que..., tendrían miedo que..., no se pueden sentir cómodos que..., tenemos mucha culpa de que..., gracias que..., se siente mal que..., and odiaba que....

In the second generation oral data, there were only three occurrences (9%) of indicative in subordinate comment clauses, found in the speech of A2 and I2. All three could be considered [-IRREALIS] and [-FUTURE], as in Example 29 from speaker I2:

Example 29
A (researcher): ¿Hay conflicto lingüístico entre los anglos y los hispanos aquí en Miami?
I2: Yo creo que más los anglos a los hispanos, como a ellos como les molesta que los hispanos han cogido (IND) las dos lenguas tan rápido. Porque hay más hispanos que hablan inglés que hay anglos que hablan español. So a ellos les molesta que nosotros hemos cogido (IND) las dos lenguas tan rápido, y casi la mayoría de todos los hispanos hablan los dos idiomas. [-IRREALIS], [-FUTURE], [+SUBJECTIVE]

Interestingly, I2 used the subjunctive on a number of other occasions following *me molesta que...*. In these other instances, however, simple present subjunctive forms were used, while the above example required present perfect subjunctive forms. One could suggest that in the productive system of this speaker the present perfect indicative forms (*han cogido*) have been overgeneralized at the expense of the present perfect subjunctive (*hanan cogido*). It is indeed
curious that present perfect subjunctive forms were not found anywhere in the oral or written discourse of I2, although the past perfect subjunctive (*hubiera hecho*) was observed in her speech and in her writing in numerous instances.

Mood expression following matrix comment clauses in the oral and written data of the third generation was highly variable, as was highlighted in the quantitative findings. For our present purposes, it is noteworthy that the indicative normally occurred in subordinate comment clauses characterized as [-IRREALIS] and [-FUTURE]. In the cases of those clauses where the semantic values [+IRREALIS] or [+FUTURE] were associated, the subjunctive was used. Examples 30-35 demonstrate this pattern in third generation discourse:

**Example 30**
I3 (talking about her sister during her high school years): Ella odiaba que le hablaban (IMP IND) español porque no se sentía cómoda. [-IRREALIS], [-FUTURE], [+SUBJECTIVE]

**Example 31**
I3 (talking about her mother): Yo creo que a ella le gustaría que me casara (PAST SUB) con alguien que- hispano, para continuar la tradición del español y todo eso. No creo que sería eh estaría brava... pero yo pienso y me da la impresión que a ella le gustaría que yo me case (SUB) con alguien hispano. [-IRREALIS], [+FUTURE], [+SUBJECTIVE]

**Example 32**
O3 (talking about his impressions of a visit to the Dominican Republic): Los negros y los blancos son, vaya, como si fueran lo
mismo. Le da lo mismo a la gente que tú eres (IND) negro o que tú eres (IND) blanco. [-IRREALIS], [-FUTURE], [+SUBJECTIVE]

Example 33
A3 (talking about the ethnic diversity of Miami): Me gusta que hay (IND) gente diferente, que no los son (IND) todos anglo americanos pero rubios y ojos azules. [-IRREALIS], [-FUTURE], [+SUBJECTIVE]

Example 34
E3: Mi mamá se casó con un americano y a él no le gusta que hablamos (IND), tú sabes, español en la casa porque él cree que estamos hablando de él. [-IRREALIS], [-FUTURE], [+SUBJECTIVE]

Example 35
A (researcher): ¿Qué hacemos con niños y jóvenes que cometen crímenes violentos? ¿Debemos castigarlos o?
M3: Yo creo que sí, los deben castigar. Pero, I mean yo estoy opuesta a que maten (SUB) a las personas porque, ¿qué van a lograr si matan a esos niños? I mean no le veo la razón en matar a otra persona por castigarla porque entonces le estás quitando el castigo. [-IRREALIS], [+FUTURE], [+SUBJECTIVE]

It is important to point out that use of the subjunctive in comment clauses in third generation speech was not limited to contexts characterized as [+IRREALIS] or [+FUTURE]. Indeed, most examples of subjunctive in comment clauses were found in [-IRREALIS] and/or [-FUTURE] contexts. In this way, the pattern discussed here does not suggest that the subjunctive in
[-IRREALIS], [-FUTURE] clauses has been replaced by the indicative among third generation speakers, but rather that variability has developed in such clauses.

King (1992) pointed out that in semantic contexts such as comment, mood selection has been variable throughout the evolution of the Spanish verb system. King cited a study by Keniston (1937) which "provides numerous examples of the indicative after verbs of opinion in pre-seventeenth century Spain" (140). Given this evidence, King (1992) maintained that in the context of such clauses, there is no evidence in support of a change in the language but rather "a contrast in the language that has been around for a long time" (140). I believe that this suggestion clearly applies to the situation of Cuban Spanish in Bilingual Miami.

2.4 Variability in modal contexts. We highlighted previously that in modal clauses, significant differences in the frequency of past subjunctive usage between Group 1 and Group 2 were revealed by a post-hoc Scheffé analysis. In modal contexts and in conditional sentences, the conditional indicative forms were used in most cases by first generation speakers of the present sample (Table 3). Past subjunctive forms and imperfect indicative forms were used variably with the conditional indicative in the speech of successive generations.

Some examples from the present oral data corpus will reflect that in hypothetical discourse, the past subjunctive may replace the conditional indicative in contexts which are semantically [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]. To demonstrate this variability, let us consider the following responses (Examples 38-44) from several second and third generation speakers to the oral interview question, ¿Cómo reaccionaría
la comunidad cubana aquí en Miami si mañana muriera Castro?,
appropriately characterized as both [+IRREALIS] and [+FUTURE]:

Example 36
I2: Oh, my God. **Fueran (PAST SUB)** fiestas por todas partes. Yo no creo que la gente **se fuera (PAST SUB)** (a Cuba), no creo. Creo que **irían (CON)** de visitas.... La comunidad cubana **estuviera (PAST SUB)** extremadamente feliz, pero yo no creo que **se fuera (PAST SUB)** porque la mayoría ya tienen sus familias aquí....
A (researcher): ¿Piensas que muchos cubanos que ahora están en la isla se vendrían para Miami?
I2: Sí, yo creo que sí. **Sería (CON)**- yo creo que **hubiera (PAST SUB)** como un cambio. Mucha gente **fueran (PAST SUB)** para allá y allá gente **vinieran (PAST SUB)** para acá.... A lo mejor **vinieran (PAST SUB), visitaban (IMP IND)**, y después **regresarían (CON)**. [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]

Example 37
S2: Wow. **Estarían (CON)** contentísimos. Pienso que muchos **se irían (CON)** para allá pero muchos **se quedarían (CON)**, tú sabes. Eh muchos **irían (CON)** para allá a hacer un mundo nuevo, a abrir sitios, como una nueva ciudad.... [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]

Example 38
I2: **Habría (CON)** una fiesta.... **Habría (CON)** mucha inversión de dólares en Cuba, pero muy poca gente yo creo que **se mudarían (CON)** de nuevo para Cuba.... [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]
Example 39
C2: La comunidad en Miami, bueno, muchos... se pasaban (IMP IND) a visitar a Cuba pero muchos se quedaban (IMP IND) en Miami. Se ponían (IMP IND) alegres pero en sí, no había (IMP IND) mucho cambio de regresar para atrás para Cuba, lo dudo. [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]

Example 40
I3: Yo creo que hubiera (PAST SUB) mucha celebración y muchas fiestas y eso. Y seguro que mucha gente regresara (PAST SUB) allá para ver a su familia.... Pero si Castro se muere, me imagino que—y el gobierno um stops being communist, todos los sanctions y las cosas de eso—haría (CON) un efecto político que simplificara la manera de poder ir y visitar a familia allí.... [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]

Example 41
A3: Oh, my God. Bueno eh la gente mayor creo que volviera (PAST SUB) para ayudar y para vivir allá otra vez.... [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]

Example 42
M3: Yo creo que muchos estarían (CON) muy felices. Muy felices. [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]

The use of the past subjunctive and the imperfect indicative to express hypotheticality in modal clauses as well as in apodoses of conditional sentences among speakers of the present sample is not a linguistic innovation of Miami Cuban Spanish. Such variability has been documented throughout the evolution of the Spanish language. Rojo and Montero (1983) and Rojo (1986) analyzed twenty eight
Spanish texts dated from the appearance of the Poema del Mío Cid to the late fourteenth century and found that the past subjunctive was used increasingly in contrary-to-fact [+IRREALIS] conditional sentences throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Table 6, adapted from Rojo (1986), demonstrates that prior to the thirteenth century, there was high variability of the imperfect indicative, conditional indicative, and past subjunctive in conditional sentences (25%, 50%, and 25%, respectively). The past subjunctive later became the most common way of expressing contrary-to-fact [+IRREALIS] conditions in Spanish between the period from 1250 to 1400 A.D. Between 1326 and 1350 A.D., the past subjunctive was almost exclusively used (94%) in conditional sentences. Table 6 displays these data, explained fully in Rojo (1986).

Table 6
Frequency of the Imperfect indicative, Conditional indicative, and Past subjunctive in [+IRREALIS] conditional sentences in Spanish, Poema del Mío Cid to 1400 (in percentages)
Adapted from Rojo (1986)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>IMPERFECT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>OTHER FORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
<td>SUBJUNCTIVE</td>
<td>FORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema del Mío Cid</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to 1230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 to 1250</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 to 1284</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284 to 1325</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326 to 1350</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351 to 1400</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other scholars (Álvarez Nazario 1972, 1990, Lope Blanch 1991, DeMello 1993, Zentella 1997) have pointed out that both the imperfect indicative and the past subjunctive forms are still sometimes found in this semantic context, particularly in Caribbean Spanish varieties. Variable usage of these forms in conditional contexts was also attested by Silva-Corvalán (1994b) among Mexican-origin speakers in Los Angeles and by Gutiérrez (1996) among Mexican-origin speakers in Houston. Because these three forms (imperfect indicative, conditional indicative, and past subjunctive) have been used variably in conditional sentences throughout the evolution of the language and still to some degree in non-contact varieties of modern-day Spanish, it is not surprising that we should find highly variable usage of them in contact varieties such as Miami Cuban Spanish.

Silva-Corvalán (1994b) pointed out that "a crucial function of verb morphology is to contribute to the proposition the meaning of 'more or less assertiveness', where assertiveness is defined as speaker belief or confidence in the probability that the proposition may be true" (77). In this way, Silva-Corvalán related speaker assertiveness to the pragmatic inference of the degrees of hypotheticality conveyed through verb morphology. Use of the present indicative or periphrastic constructions would add more assertiveness to the speaker's proposition, while the conditional indicative or past (imperfect) subjunctive would convey the least degree of certainty or assertiveness. These notions put forth by Silva-Corvalán (1994b: 78) are displayed in Figure 6.
Silva-Corvalán's (1994b) scale of assertiveness conveyed by verb morphology in reference to non-past situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most assertiveness</th>
<th>Least assertiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Present indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least hypothetical</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most hypothetical</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect subjunctive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Silva-Corvalán stated that the lower proficiency speakers, i.e. some second and third generation speakers, included in her study (1994b) used mostly the present indicative forms to convey hypotheticality, thus conveying "a strong degree of assertiveness and predictive certainty, without differentiating between more or less possible situations in the hypothetical world created" (91).

In the present data sample, however, first, second and third generation speakers alike appeared capable of expressing differential degrees of assertiveness according to the scale proposed by Silva-Corvalán (1994b), above. All thirty speakers used forms of the past subjunctive somewhere in their hypothetical discourse (modal propositions and conditional sentences). Furthermore, use of the present indicative forms and periphrastic constructions in modal propositions was not limited to the speech of successive generations; it also characterized the speech of the first generation. In terms of the degree of assertiveness conveyed and/or the ability to differentiate degrees of possibility in the "hypothetical world," the oral discourse of all three generations appeared to differ little. For the present purposes, let us compare the responses (Examples 43-46) to the oral interview
question, ¿Cómo crees que reaccionaría la comunidad cubana aquí en Miami si mañana muriera Castro?, offered by two first generation speakers (L1 and P1) and two third generation speakers (C3 and E3).

**Example 43**

L1: Bueno, supongo que muchos **celebrarían** (CON) una fiesta, ¿no? Esto- yo no creo que mucha gente **se iría** (CON) de momento para Cuba. Supongo que algunos— no creo que es, que sea así como que todo el mundo **se va a ir** (PER IND) inmediatamente que se caiga Castro o que se muera Castro o que pase— eh lo más probable es que muera en el poder, ¿no? Entonces vamos a suponernos si muriera mañana o que lo que fuera, yo creo que **no va a ir** (PER IND) para Cuba mucha gente.

**Example 44**

A (researcher): ¿Piensa que muchos (cubanos) volverían a la isla?  
P1: De los viejos sí, y de los jóvenes sí, si pudieran viajar al pasado.... Mas que hoy día- si de hoy a mañana en un año, en un mes, en tres años, el gobierno de Cuba cesa, y nosotros tenemos chance de regresar, en la actual situación, situación en que está Cuba, muy pocos **regresan** (IND).... Por ejemplo, ¿regresaría (CON) yo a mi pueblo? Nunca jamás. Mi pueblo se está cayendo.... **Tendrían que construir** (CON) la casa ellos el día después. Mas dejar la comodidad, el confort, para ir a vivir sin aire acondicionado, sin agua caliente, sin esto, sin aquello, sin el paper towel, sin disposable dishes, eh **va a ser** (PER IND) muy difícil. Así es como **va a reaccionar** (PER IND) la comunidad.

**Example 45**

C3: Yo creo que muchos de como de la edad de mis abuelos y de algunos de mis padres seguro que **regresan** (IND) a ver cómo está. No sé si **se mudan** (IND) permanente, pero ya yo creo que los hispanos de
mi edad o hasta mis padres no creo que regresen (SUB) permanente. Visitan (IND), pero no permanente....
A (researcher): ¿Y tú? ¿Te quedarías?
C3: Sí, yo me quedo (IND) aquí.

Example 46
E3: Festival.... (talking about the older generation) Yo no creo que ellos van a regresar (PER IND) a la isla.... Es que depende, tú sabes, porque ellos no van a dejar (PER IND) el trabajo que tienen aquí.... Quién va a coger a Cuba? ¿Los Estados Unidos? Si eso pasa, puede ser que los americanos se pueden mover (IND) allí y establecer sus cosas.

All four of the above speakers used the present indicative or the periphrastic forms to express their belief that most Cubans would not return to the island in the event of Castro's demise. While these verb forms do contribute to the assertiveness of their propositions, it is also apparent in the above examples (43-46) that first and third generation speakers alike use them syntactically, semantically, and pragmatically in the same contexts and to convey the same meanings.

2.5 Variability in uncertainty clauses. Most oral discourse tokens from the category of uncertainty were observed in arguments, that is, discourse constructed to support or refute a point being made by the speaker with respect to some controversial social or political issue. In the great majority of cases, the contexts of usage were subordinate clauses following the matrices No creo que... and No pienso que.... For this reason, the present considerations are limited to mood selection within the context of argumentation. To this discourse context we may apply Silva-Corvalán's (1994b) notion that the use of the indicative in a subordinate clause following one of the above matrices could lend the
speaker a higher of degree of assertiveness, as demonstrated in Figure 6 (Silva-Corvalán 1994b).

However, I will point out that although the degree of assertiveness connected to mood selection may influence the listener's perceptions of the speaker's propositions, assertiveness is not in itself a conditioning factor in the variability observed among the present speakers. Instead, the semantic values assigned to speakers' propositions with respect to futurity [+FUTURE] and reality [+IRREALIS] play the principal role in conditioning mood variability, irrespective of generational background. To this suggestion, we will add the semantic factor [+ARGUMENT], i.e. the form is used in relation to an argument being developed by the speaker to support or refute a particular position. Finally, we will take into account the pragmatic factor of relevance [+RELEVANCE] highlighted by both Lavandera (1983) and Lunn (1989), explained in Chapter Two.

The present evidence will support that in argumentative [+ARGUMENT] discourse contexts where the present speakers associated with the proposition a greater degree of futurity [+FUTURE], irreality [+IRREALIS], and/or irrelevance [-RELEVANT], the subjunctive was normally used. If the proposition could have been considered [-IRREALIS], i.e. an observable reality, or if the proposition was [-FUTURE], i.e. anchored in the present moment, the indicative was preferred by most second and third generation speakers. In a few cases, though, the speaker wished to pragmatically convey that the proposition was irrelevant [-RELEVANT] to the argument. In these cases, speakers apparently overrode the values [-FUTURE] and/or [-IRREALIS] and used the subjunctive to convey the [-RELEVANT] value of the proposition. The following examples (49-57), all taken from the oral discourse of second and third generation speakers, demonstrate these patterns.
Examples 47 and 48 are paired examples which demonstrate the subjunctive/indicative opposition made in the speech of the same speaker (C2). In Example 47, C2 (second generation) used the subjunctive where futurity was implicated, since the debate during the fall of 1998 was over whether or not Clinton should resign in the near future as a consequence of the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal. In Example 48, where futurity was not implicated, C2 used the indicative since the Official English legislation about which he offered his opinions presently existed in the state of Florida.

**Example 47**

C2 (talking about Clinton and the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal): No pienso que deba (SUB) resignar. [+FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

**Example 48**

C2 (talking about existing Official English legislation in Florida): Yo no pienso que deben (IND) poner esa restricción o el límite de inglés no más. Yo no estoy de acuerdo con eso. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

Examples 49-55 further support the notion that the indicative was used by the present speakers in relevant argumentative propositions where the values [-FUTURE] and/or [-IRREALIS] applied. In any proposition where futurity and/or irreality pertained, the subjunctive was normally used. Example 49 was taken from the oral interview of speaker S3 (third generation); Examples 50 and 51 (paired examples) both came from speaker G3 (third generation); Examples 52 and 53 (paired examples) were taken from speaker A3 (third
generation); and Examples 54 and 55 (paired examples) both came from the oral discourse of speaker T2 (second generation).

**Example 49**
S3 (talking about Spanish-speaking immigrants' need to learn English in Miami): Cuando vienen a Miami ven que es tan fácil, tú sabes, no tener que saberlo, que no ponen el esfuerzo. No creo que eso es (IND) muy propio. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

**Example 50**
G3 (talking about Clinton and the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal): Yo no creo que, I mean, que sea (SUB) un problema grande, o sea, que tenga (SUB) que resignar, you know, por lo que hizo. [+FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

**Example 51**
G3 (talking about miscommunication between Spanish and English monolinguals in Bilingual Miami): Yo no creo que es (IND) un problema grande. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

**Example 52**
A3 (talking about the possibility of her grandmother's returning to Cuba after Castro's demise): Puede ser que volvería a ver cómo está y a visitar, pero no a vivir. Yo no creo que ninguno de mi familia se vayan (SUB) a vivir. [+FUTURE], [+IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

**Example 53**
A3 (talking about exciting affirmative action programs in academia): No creo que la gente, porque son diferentes, porque si vienen de
diferentes culturas, no creo que deben (IND) tener una ventaja nada más que por eso. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

**Example 54**

T2 (talking about the existing practice of holding back schoolchildren with limited English proficiency): No pienso que está (IND) bien atrasar a alguien porque no sepa el inglés. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

**Example 55**

T2 (talking about the possibility of returning to Cuba after Castro's demise): Bueno, yo te digo ahora que yo no me voy para Cuba.... ni mis padres tampoco, ni mis abuelos, no creo.... yo no pienso que ellos se vayan (SUB). [+FUTURE], [+IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT]

Example 56, which follows, was taken from L2's response to the interview question, ¿Crees que se le hace difícil la vida a la persona que no sepa inglés en Miami? It is interesting to note that she used the subjunctive to express the irrelevance of the proposition that such a situation would be difficult (No creo que sea difícil) since in her next proposition (todo depende en el área donde uno esté) she clarified that the relevant answer must be based on consideration of where the person lives and works. Therefore, the subjunctive was used. Example 57, on the other hand, demonstrates that where the proposition was relevant to the argument, and the values [-FUTURE] and [-IRREALIS] were applicable, the indicative occurred.
Example 56
L2 (talking about those who live in Miami who speak only Spanish):
No creo que sea (SUB) difícil, pero todo depende en el área donde uno esté. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT], [-RELEVANT]

Example 57
L2 (talking about ethnic identifying categories on official paperwork):
No creo que deberían existir. No creo que son (IND) válidas.
[-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT], [+RELEVANT]

Examples 58 and 59, from speaker M3 (third generation), follow the same pattern demonstrated by speaker L2 in Examples 56 and 57, above. In Example 58, the indicative was used where M3 deemed the proposition relevant to support her point that Hillary Clinton's suggestion that "it takes a village to raise a child" is unfounded. In Example 59, M3 used the subjunctive to express the irrelevance of the proposition that some youth are violent because they are born that way (Yo no creo que nazcan así) since she clarified in the next proposition that everyone is born the same and that one's temperament is the result of social development (todo el mundo nace igual, sabes, y después se crean los temperamentos y eso).

Example 58
M3 (talking about Hillary Clinton): 'It takes a village to raise a child?'
Yo eso no lo creo cierto..., no. I think it takes a family. I mean if you don't have a mother- si no tienes una madre, entonces un padre pero,
¿sabes? Alguien que te sepa enseñar. I mean, no creo que necesitas (IND) una comunidad entera para criar a los niños, no. [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT], [+RELEVANT]

**Example 59**

M3 (talking about violent adolescents): Yo no creo que nazcan (SUB) así porque todo el mundo nace igual, sabes, y después se crean los temperamentos y eso.... [-FUTURE], [-IRREALIS], [+ARGUMENT], [-RELEVANT]

In summary, all of the above examples (47-59) offer support for the following: In discourse contexts classified as [+ARGUMENT], the speaker may choose to use the subjunctive or the indicative in subordinate clauses following matrices such as *No creo que...*, *No pienso que...* and *Dudo que...*. If the proposition found in the subordinate clause is considered [-RELEVANT] in the speaker's opinion, the subjunctive is chosen. If the proposition found in the subordinate clause is considered [+RELEVANT] and the values [+FUTURE] and/or [+IRREALIS] apply to the proposition, the subjunctive is chosen. If the proposition found in the subordinate clause is considered [+RELEVANT] and both of the values [-FUTURE] and [-IRREALIS] apply to the proposition, the indicative is used. Diagram 1, below, demonstrates this notion.
Diagram 1
Mood selection in the argumentative oral discourse of second and third generation Miami Cuban Spanish speakers

\[ [+\text{ARGUMENT}] \quad \downarrow \]
\[ [+\text{RELEVANT}] \quad [\text{-RELEVANT}] \]
\[ [+\text{IRREALIS}] \quad [\text{-IRREALIS}] \quad \downarrow \]
\[ \text{subjunctive} \]
\[ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \]

The variability of mood in the discourse of successive generations discussed thus far was observed in variable categories of usage for non-contact varieties of modern-day Spanish. It was previously pointed out in the quantitative analysis that the only variability of mood selection in categorical contexts occurred in subordinate volitional clauses. Section 2.6, following, considers the possible linguistic factors which may explain why some speakers used the indicative in volitional contexts.

2.6 Usage of the indicative in volitional contexts. The occurrence of the indicative in volitional contexts was very rare. Of the total sample, there were only seven speakers who, on one or more occasions, used the indicative in a volitional context: C2, J2, R2 (second generation) and A3, E3, I3, S3 (third generation). Some examples from their oral and written discourse will point to the importance of phonological and morphological factors in this variable usage. In the examples which
follow, we may observe two patterns: 1) the past subjunctive is sometimes replaced by the present or imperfect indicative in past tense contexts and, 2) the subjunctive is sometimes replaced by the indicative in the case of verbs which constitute phonological minimal pairs in their respective conjugations. These same patterns were also observed by Zentella (1997) in her longitudinal study of Puerto Rican Spanish speakers in New York City.

The most generalized usage of the indicative in volitional subordinate clauses was observed in the discourse of E3. Example 60 demonstrates the first pattern described above—replacement of the subjunctive in past tense contexts.

**Example 60**

E3: Mi mamá siempre quería que- que *tenemos* (IND) eh los grados buenos.... Ella quería que nosotros eh *aprendemos* (IND) lo que necesitamos eh— no, ella quería que nosotros eh *aprendemos* (IND) um *aprend* (*verb root*)— *aprendemos* (IND)? eh a cocinar arroz porque si por si acaso ella no está, sabes eh cocinar arroz y puedes cenar eso o-tú sabes, siempre tener arroz. Ella siempre quería que nosotros eh **to do the basics** (*code switch*), tú sabes....

E3’s hesitation with respect to verb usage is clearly evident in Example 60. It appears that she is aware that she may be incorrect in her usage of verb forms following the past tense *querer que* clause. In the case of the past subjunctive form of *aprender* (above), which she never accurately produced, E3 paused, repeated what she had previously said, paused again, and then used a rising interrogative intonation with the present tense indicative form *aprendemos*. She then paused to see if her interlocutor would offer her the accurate form before continuing. When the context arose again, she seemingly
avoided the problem by switching to English (*Ella siempre quería que nosotros eh to do the basics, tú sabes....*).

However, E3 switched to the subjunctive accurately in her response to the subsequent question posed in the oral interview, where past tense was not implicated, but rather futurity. Five out of six verbs used by E3 in her response (Example 61) to the interview question *¿Qué vas a querer para tus hijos el día que tengas hijos?* appeared in the subjunctive.

**Example 61**

A (researcher): *¿Y qué vas a querer para tus hijos el día que tengas hijos?*

E3: Que *tengan* (SUB) un futuro bueno, que ellos *sepan* (SUB) hacer las cosas que ellos necesitan hacer. Que no *tengan* (SUB) que eh—no es malo pero no quiero que *piden* (IND) por mucha ayuda, tú sabes.... Que *tengan* (SUB) un futuro bueno eh, y que no *se casen* (SUB) temprano.

In the previous example (61), we may observe the second pattern mentioned above—replacement of the subjunctive in the case of verbs which constitute phonological minimal pairs in their respective conjugations. The verb form *piden* (indicative) replaces the expected *pidan* (subjunctive). However, the subsequent verb *casen* (subjunctive), which also constitutes a minimal pair with the indicative *casan*, is rendered in the subjunctive.

Speaker E3’s responses to items 5, 8, 19, and 31 of the written sentence completion task reflect that she indeed possesses productive skill in the subjunctive in volitional contexts. For items 8, 19, and 31, she wrote an accurate form of the subjunctive. In item 5, E3 wrote the form *vive* for what should have been *viva*, suggesting that she knew
that the subjunctive must be used (and not the indicative *vivo*), even though her morphological ending was erroneous. Her responses to each item are offered below:

**Item 5 (E3):** Mis padres siempre han querido que yo *vive (inaccurate form)* una vida que Dios quiera.

**Item 8 (E3):** Yo quiero que mis hijos *tengan (SUB)* una vida feliz.

**Item 19 (E3):** Mis padres siempre esperaban que yo *cojiera (PAST SUB)* buenos grados.

**Item 31 (E3):** Toda mi vida yo he esperado que Dios me *ayude (SUB)* con todo que hago.

The discourse of speaker S3 again reflects the same two patterns evident in the discourse of E3. In Example 62, the indicative was used in a past tense context, and in Example 63, the indicative *aprenden* used by the speaker constitutes a phonological minimal pair with the subjunctive *aprendan*, the form expected in this context.

**Example 62**

S3: Mi mamá siempre quería que mis hermanos y yo *éramos (IMP IND)* bilingües.

**Example 63**

S3 (talking about Spanish in public schools): Deben empujar que *aprenden (IND)* más idiomas.

There is clear evidence, on the other hand, that the subjunctive forms normatively required in this context are indeed part of S3’s verb repertoire. In Example 64, she accurately used the subjunctive after the matrix clause *quiero que* and in her written responses to items 5 and 19
of the sentence completion task, the past subjunctive was accurately used. These examples follow:

**Example 64**
S3 (talking about her future children): Quiero que sean (SUB) bien educados. Mis hijos van a tener que ser bilingües.

**Item 5 (S3):** Mis padres siempre han querido que yo hablara (PAST SUB) inglés y español.
**Item 19 (S3):** Mis padres siempre esperaban que yo fuera (PAST SUB) bien educada.

The speech of C2 and J2 reflect the concurrence of the two patterns discussed above (imperfect indicative usage in place of the past subjunctive, plus a form which has a phonological minimal pair in the subjunctive). C2’s usage of estudiaban (imperfect indicative) in Example 65 constitutes a phonological minimal pair with the expected estudiaran (past subjunctive). In Example 66, J2’s discourse reflects that both the past subjunctive casara and the imperfect indicative casaba are part of his verb repertoire since he uses both of them, as if in free variation, in the same paragraph. These examples follow:

**Example 65**
C2 (talking about his future children): Mis hijos quisiera que estudiaban (IMP IND) lo que ellos quisieran estudiar. Yo estaría contento.

**Example 66**
J2 (talking about his parents): Ellos siempre preferían que yo me casaba (IMP IND) con una cubana más que nada, pero ellos siempre me decían
que si una— si yo la quiero y si ella me quiere a mí eso es lo que importa. Ellos siempre me decían eso pero yo sé que ellos preferían que yo me casara (PAST SUB) con una cubana o una hispana.

**Summary and conclusions**

In this chapter, I highlighted that the variability of mood selection was quite high among second and third generation speakers in a number of semantically variable categories of usage. The results of the quantitative oral data analysis carried out in the present investigation revealed statistically significant differences in the frequency of indicative usage between the first and third generations in adjectival and comment clauses, and between the first and second generations with respect to subjunctive usage in modal contexts. One other context of usage—uncertainty—approached statistical significance (p=.06) of differences in the frequency of indicative usage between the three groups of speakers (N=30). Analysis of the sentence completion task completed by a subsample of second and third generation speakers (N=13) enrolled in a Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) course found high variability in semantically variable contexts in written discourse as well. I pointed out that in several cases, mood variability was higher in writing than in speech.

Qualititative analysis of the oral and written discourse of the present sample was highlighted in the second section. The analysis focused on the four contexts of usage which held statistical import relevant to intergenerational differences (adjective, comment, modal, and uncertainty). Additionally, I considered possible explanations for the appearance of the indicative in the volitional context, the only semantically categorical context of usage where the indicative was observed in the present data corpus. I offered various examples from
oral and written discourse which support that the high variability of mood selection among second and third generation speakers in adjective, comment, modal, and uncertainty contexts appears to be determined mostly by the semantic values applicable to the particular case.

In adjectival and comment clauses where greater degrees of futurity [+FUTURE] and/or irreality [+IRREALIS] are associated, the subjunctive forms were used. In such clauses where futurity is not implicated [-FUTURE], and/or reality is reflected [-IRREALIS], the indicative forms were variably used by the second generation and preferentially used by the third generation. In modal contexts, the past subjunctive and the imperfect indicative forms were variably used with the conditional indicative forms in second and third generation speech to express hypotheticality. This variation is not innovative in Miami Cuban Spanish but has been attested throughout the evolution of the Spanish language and in several non-contact varieties of modern-day Spanish as well, particularly in the Caribbean. In uncertainty clauses found in argumentative discourse, use of the indicative was conditioned by the pertinence of three specific values: pragmatically [+RELEVANT], semantically [-IRREALIS] and semantically [-FUTURE]. Where any one of the opposite values pertain ([+RELEVANT], [+IRREALIS], [+FUTURE]), the subjunctive was normally used.

The findings made in these quantitative and qualitative analyses will be discussed in relation to linguistic-level contact and individual and social bilingualism among the present sample in Chapter Six. The chapter will attempt a response to the language maintenance question concerning Miami Cuban Spanish, and will also address pedagogical implications of the findings for Spanish for Native Speakers classrooms.
Chapter 6
Discussion and Conclusions

Introduction
The findings of this study indicate that in the Spanish of three generations of Cubans in Miami there is 1) expansion of the indicative in place of the subjunctive in variable contexts, in cases where specific semantic and pragmatic values apply and, 2) expansion of the past subjunctive in hypothetical discourse in the speech of the second and third generations. In categorical contexts of usage (except volition), the subjunctive forms were found in second and third generation speech with the same frequency as in first generation speech. But what does this observation mean in terms of language contact, bilingualism, and the fate of Miami Cuban Spanish?

This chapter will respond to each one of these areas of inquiry in light of the present analysis. In section one, the question of 'interference' or 'transfer' between the present two grammatical systems in contact will be addressed. Section two will relate the variability observed in the present data to the phenomenon of Spanish-English bilingualism in the Miami context and to broader, general theoretical notions of bilingualism. Section three will then visit the language maintenance/loss polemic in the study of language contact and attempt to place in perspective the present findings from Miami. The limitations of the present study will be described in section four, and suggested directions for future research and pedagogical implications of the study will be stated in sections five and six, respectively.
1. Relationship of the findings to the study of language contact

Does the evidence presented here support the notion that the lack of subjunctive in the English verb system causes the reduction of subjunctive in the Spanish verb system? In the case of Miami Cuban Spanish, I believe that, for the most part, it does not. The variability of the subjunctive/indicative opposition among successive generations of Cuban Spanish speakers in Miami appears to be linguistically unrelated to direct contact with the English system, for a number of reasons which I will elaborate in the following paragraphs.

First, the reduction of subjunctive usage evidenced in the speech and the writing of second and third generation speakers does not occur in an 'across the board' fashion. Rather, differentiation between the first and successive generations is found in particular discourse semantic contexts, ones which already demonstrate variability in non-contact varieties of Spanish. If the increased variability of the Spanish subjunctive in the verb system of the bilinguals under study were indeed directly related to contact with the English system (which lacks subjunctive morphology), we would find empirical evidence of such variability indiscriminately across all discourse semantic contexts. This, however, is not the case.

Instead, we find evidence of the reduction of the subjunctive only where specific semantic values apply (as described in Chapter Five), values which are inherent in the Spanish semantic system. As such, I maintain that we may extend to the situation of Cuban Spanish in Bilingual Miami the notion proposed by King (1992) about the primordiality of semantic values in Spanish subjunctive usage:

1 Torreblanca (1997) affirmed: "Al igual que lo ocurrido en otras lenguas románicas, en español ha habido una batalla continua entre el modo indicativo y el subjuntivo en ciertas estructuras sintácticas; ha existido una tendencia popular a la simplificación de la gramática mediante la eliminación del modo subjuntivo... El español hablado en los Estados Unidos es un fiel reflejo de esta tendencia popular." (137).
[T]he systematic semantics of the (subjunctive/indicative) opposition should be the same for all speakers, with variation occurring at the level of actual language use. Thus it may be that a determined usage is based on a dialect, but such pragmatic usage should derive directly from the systematic meaning of the form.... [I]solated usage in a given dialect must have semantic motivation, and...dialectal or individual usage can be equated with the utilization of a given meaning in varying pragmatic contexts. (141-142)

As such, King (1992) suggests that mood variability in the past and present-day systems of the Spanish language is principally motivated by semantic factors. The variability observed among the bilinguals comprising the present sample demonstrates that the case of Miami Cuban Spanish appears to be no exception within the universal framework of World Spanish.

Thus, I would deem inappropriate the use of the terms ‘interference’ or ‘transfer’ in this example of contact between two grammatical systems. The linguistic evidence at hand favors the claim that in the situation of language contact, spaces of variability in the grammatical system of a language X may be extrinsically impacted by contact with a language Y, irrespective of the character or typology of language Y’s grammatical system (cf. Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Romaine 1995, Silva-Corvalán 1994b). Silva-Corvalán (1994b) stated that “there seems sufficient evidence to maintain that language contact has the effect of speeding up simplification and diffusion of changes. In regard to minority languages, these tend to be changes already present in the non-contact ancestor variety, i.e. they have intralinguistic roots” (214). Although the influence of the English
semantic system cannot be dismissed entirely, I believe that the findings of the present inquiry into the subjunctive usage of Miami Cuban Spanish-English bilinguals supports the notion explained by Silva-Corvalán (1994b) above.

2. Relationship of the findings to the study of bilingualism
If we accept that the premises developed in Chapter Three validate use of the term 'bilingual' in relation to the broader social context of Miami, then we inherently put forth the notion that the Cuban Spanish spoken in Miami is, normatively, a bilingual variety, i.e. one which differentiates itself to some extent from monolingual varieties on various linguistic planes. The present study has empirically documented at least one grammatical aspect in which bilingual Miami Cuban Spanish is apparently different from monolingual Cuban Spanish. The differentiation of first generation Cuban Spanish from that of second and third generations within this particular grammatical space of variability suggests that although proficiency in the language is maintained by successive generations, the mood system which they exhibit in performance and which they will ultimately transmit to successive generations is highly unstable.²

Romaine (1995) explained the evolution of linguistic norms in relation to the concept of bilingual proficiency in contact societies as follows:

Because new and different norms develop in (language contact) situations, there are problems in talking about proficiency because competence may span several codes which are unequally developed. It is possible for a bilingual to be fluent in both languages taken together without being able to function like a monolingual in either one on its own. (320)

In this way, the term proficiency within the framework of social bilingualism appears undefined, as it has mostly throughout the literature on second language acquisition as well.

Which group defines normative mood distinction in Miami Cuban Spanish—the first generation, the second generation, or the third? Which speakers are more highly proficient with respect to mood selection? Response to these questions is theoretically beyond the scope of this dissertation. It seems to me, however, that the evidence presented throughout the various stages of this investigation would support that balanced bilingualism is characteristic of the Miami setting, and the findings revealed at the individual and generational levels would suggest the same. Notwithstanding, the grammatical elements which define generational-level proficiency are shifting ones, such that if Spanish is still fluently spoken by the fourth generation and beyond, it will probably manifest itself as a distinctive variety, unless social and educational normative forces become stronger in Miami in the future.
3. What the findings tell us about the fate of Cuban Spanish in Miami

3.1 Defining ‘loss’. Inherent and inevitable in most discussions of language maintenance is the use of the term ‘loss’. Indeed the motivation for addressing language maintenance in contact situations is the question of loss and the extent to which this phenomenon is evident in the linguistic system of bilingual speakers. A perusal of the research literature on the topic reveals, however, that the term ‘loss’, apparently used synonymously in most reports with the term ‘attrition’, has never been systematically defined. Many researchers speak of language loss without first establishing in the reports of their inquiries what they understand as ‘loss’ per se.

I maintain that the terms ‘loss’ and ‘attrition’ are most appropriately used in the context of diachronic studies which document the performance of the same individual speakers or group of speakers over a specified period of time (for example, Zentella 1997 on Puerto Rican-origin bilinguals in New York City), but may also be used, albeit with more imprecision, in the context of synchronic studies.

Although definition of the terms ‘loss’ and ‘attrition’ is far beyond the scope of the present work, on either the theoretical or applied planes, it seems necessary that I explicitly state the concepts which I propose to be understood by several key terms in the context of my discussion:

If the frequency of a form A in language X, systematically evident in the discourse of a particular speaker or group of speakers in a specified time frame (or a specified generation of speakers in apparent time), is substantially lower in the discourse of the same speaker or
group of speakers in a subsequent specified time frame, probably a number of years or decades later (or in a subsequent generation of speakers in apparent time), 'reduction' is attested.

Conversely, if the frequency of a form A in language X, systematically evident in the discourse of a particular speaker or group of speakers in a specified time frame (or a specified generation of speakers in apparent time), is substantially higher in the discourse of the same speaker or group of speakers in a subsequent specified time frame, probably a number of years or decades later (or in a subsequent generation of speakers in apparent time), 'expansion' or 'generalization' is attested.

'Simplification' is attested in cases of reduction in which the system of language X determining the usage of form A by a particular speaker or group of speakers is simplified, to the end that a specified context of usage for form A is eliminated at the same time that other contexts of usage for form A remain. This definition concurs with the one put forth by Silva-Corvalán (1995):

[S]implification involves the higher frequency of a form X in context Y (i.e., generalization) at the expense of a form Z, usually in competition with and semantically closely related to X, where both X and Z existed in the language prior to the initiation of simplification. If simplification reaches completion, its final outcome is reduction or loss of forms and elimination of alternatives, i.e., a simplified system with fewer forms, and possibly, though not necessarily, loss of meanings. (6)

Following Silva-Corvalán (above), I maintain that if a form A in language X is systematically evident in the discourse of a particular speaker or group of speakers in a specified time frame (or a specified
generation of speakers in apparent time), and then absolutely **nonevident** in the discourse of the same speaker or group of speakers in a subsequent specified time frame, probably a number of years or decades later (or in a subsequent generation of speakers in apparent time), the term 'loss' is most appropriately used.

I would further suggest that if a **form** A in language X is systematically evident in the discourse of a particular speaker or group of speakers in a specified time frame (or a specified generation of speakers in apparent time), and then **unsystematically evident** in the discourse of the same speaker or group of speakers in a subsequent specified time frame, probably a number of years or decades later (or in a subsequent generation of speakers in apparent time), the term 'attrition' seems more appropriate than 'loss'. Simplification and, inherently, attrition would represent necessary stages in the processes ultimately leading to 'loss', the latter term implying the completion of simplification.

Having made clear the definitions which I am following for the present purposes, I turn now to the question of language maintenance and loss among successive generations of Cuban Spanish speakers in Miami, based on the present sample.

### 3.2 Maintenance and loss in the Miami context

#### 3.2.1 Linguistic level considerations.

The variability of mood selection observed in variable discourse contexts among the present sample reflects systematic usage of the subjunctive and indicative, conditioned by semantic factors, among all three generations of speakers. However, the subjunctive has clearly undergone simplification at the semantic level in several contexts, e.g. adjectival, comment, and uncertainty.
While it is logical to reason that simplification is a necessary stage in the process of eventual loss of a particular form (cf. Silva-Corvalán 1994b), it is important to recognize that the system determining mood distinction in the discourse of the present second and third generation speakers is still fully operative, semantically and pragmatically, even in the contexts where statistical between-group differences were found.

If we compare the findings of the present study to the findings of Silva-Corvalán’s (1994b) study of successive generations of Mexican-origin Spanish speakers in Los Angeles, it becomes apparent that the patterns of reduction and the processes of simplification affecting the verb system of those bilinguals are the same ones affecting the system of Miami Cuban bilinguals. However, the rate at which these systems become intergenerationally more simplified is different.

For example, the imperfect subjunctive was never used in spontaneous oral discourse by eight of the sixteen Group 3 (third generation) speakers included in Silva-Corvalán’s study (1994b: 28). In the present study, all ten of the third generation speakers interviewed accurately used the imperfect (past) subjunctive forms of a number of regular and irregular verbs in numerous discourse contexts. Similarly, in Silva-Corvalán’s study (1994b) the conditional indicative in hypothetical discourse contexts (with future reference) was never used by nine of sixteen third generation speakers; of the remaining seven, only one produced this form systematically (28). In the present study, only one third generation speaker (E3) never produced the conditional indicative in spontaneous oral discourse; of the remaining nine speakers of the present third generation sample, seven produced the modal conditional systematically, and two produced it sporadically.
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It is clear that both of these research endeavors uncover similar linguistic processes of simplification in the Spanish of the respective bilingual groups, yet the present Miami Cuban speakers exhibit a substantially slower rate of simplification than do the Los Angeles Mexicans included in Silva-Corvalán's (1994b) study. Concomitantly, the loss of mood distinction was not observed among the present third generation sample of Miami Cubans, while loss was attested by Silva-Corvalán among third generation Los Angeles Mexicans.

Although the present findings support that loss of the subjunctive is not evident among second and third generation speakers in Miami (indeed, the patterns and frequencies of usage found in second generation speech are strikingly similar to those of the first generation in some cases), the third generation sample as a whole appears to be opening the way for loss of mood distinction and the modal expression of hypotheticality in the Spanish of their future children and grandchildren.

The simplified and highly variable system of mood distinction which the present third generation transmits to the future fourth and fifth generations could theoretically be maintained as such, in which case complete loss would never occur. Rather, the incomplete acquisition of the normative mood system by today's third generation would cause the Spanish of the fourth and fifth generations to reflect a simplified system. Weinreich (1968) affirmed this notion as pertains to child language acquisition in a contact situation:

[M]any children learn both languages from the same persons, namely, their parents. It has been alleged that this fact in itself inhibits satisfactory language learning. What is certain is that if the parents are their children's teachers of both languages, then
their own errors in both languages are transmitted to the next generation. (84)

Although the term 'error' seems theoretically questionable in reference to the space of variability which immediately concerns us, the concept that the reduced usage of subjunctive by third generation speakers may be transmitted to the fourth and fifth generations seems plausible.

In the theoretical sense, the above postulate is convincing. In the applied sense, however, within the dynamic, bilingual social context which is Miami, the argument for simplification and ultimate loss among successive generations appears somewhat less persuasive for several reasons. These reasons will be stated in the following subsection.

3.2.2 Social level considerations. In Chapter Three, section 3.3, I highlighted a number of present-day social, economic, and political factors which are crucial in our considerations of the future of Spanish-speaking Miami. Among those factors was the phenomenon of "recontact" (cf. Cisneros & Leone 1983), which I will recapitulate here.

The term "recontact" encompasses the seeming "revival" of a heritage language among successive generations due to the linguistic influence of social contact with more recently arrived immigrants who are either monolinguals or dominant bilinguals of the heritage language. Such situations are the result of family visits, within-family immigration, friendships, romances, marriages, and work partnerships with monolingual or dominant bilingual speakers of the heritage language.

Among the present second and third generation sample, this phenomenon was amply observed in the personal information
provided in the oral interviews. Since social level "recontact" with Spanish among Miami Cubans would be the topic of a separate study, I will only mention here that the observations presently made are overwhelmingly suggestive of the force of this phenomenon in bilingual Miami. In a city where new immigration occurs at such a high rate and where Hispanics are the demographic majority, there is substantial probability that already-established immigrants and their American-born offspring will have intimate personal and professional contact with recently-arrived Spanish monolinguals and Spanish-dominant bilinguals. It is worthwhile to again point out, as I did in Chapter Three, that there is no evidence to suggest that immigration into Miami from the Spanish-speaking world will wane in the coming decades (Roca 1991, Boswell 1994).

Moreover, I explained in Chapter Three that a highly dynamic social exchange between Havana and Miami, owing to the large number of Cubans in Miami and the geographic proximity of the two cities, would develop under the circumstances of more open political relations between Cuba and the United States. Indeed, many Miami Cubans presently estimate that the fall of Castro's government may have a much stronger impact in sociolinguistic terms than in purely political or economic terms (Gutiérrez 1998, personal communication). Beyond considerations of Cuban Miami, the greater metropolitan area's sociocultural, economic and geographic intimacy with many countries of the Spanish-speaking World make its bond with the Spanish language seemingly undeniable in the globalization of the coming decades.

Although we cannot be certain how future generations of Spanish-English bilinguals will go about constructing the sociolinguistic reality of Miami beyond the year 2000, we can rely on
the observations, both empirical and anecdotal, that we have from forty years of Spanish-English contact there. Since the beginning of their mass arrival in the 1960s, Cuban Spanish speakers and their bilingual children, called the "1.5 generation" by scholars such as Pérez Firmat (1994), have seen the importance and presence of their language steadily expand. This expansion has occurred not only through widescale Hispanic immigration, but also through business, finance, trade, tourism, employment, education, mass communication, arts and entertainment, religion, and everyday social interaction in Miami’s public domains (as I explained in Chapter Three).

At the same time, English language use has remained vital in Miami, such that it is important to point out that the expansion and spread of Spanish in the Miami context has not been to the exclusion or detriment of English. Despite the myths and unfounded beliefs popularly held by Americans outside of Miami, there is no empirical sociolinguistic research to suggest that English is being socially lost, or is not being fully acquired by successive generations of Hispanic immigrants there. Every empirical source points to the contrary. All of the second and third-generation bilinguals whom I interviewed in the present research project, and all with whom I have spoken informally as an outsider within the past year, have clearly insisted on the importance and, in most cases, preferred use of English in their educational, professional, and everyday lives. Such an affirmation, however, does not deny their proficiency in Spanish and the social and economic value which they place on Spanish and on being bilingual.

I propose that if anywhere in the U.S. context, it is in Miami that we find the greatest potential for sustained Spanish language use in the coming decades, due to the city’s dynamic social relationship with the Spanish-speaking World and the somewhat prestigious
socioeconomic position and instrumental role which the language occupies in Miami. In conclusion, I suggest that the social and economic value of both languages will remain high and that processes of contact and recontact with the Spanish-speaking World will continue to shape acquisition, use, and maintenance of Spanish among subsequent generations of Miami bilinguals, obviously to a greater degree for some than for others.

4. Limitations
An important limitation of the present methodology for which we must account is the socioeconomic and racial background of the present sample. All thirty Cuban-origin speakers included in this analysis were of the middle socioeconomic class and were white. Lambert and Taylor's (1996) study on Spanish language among successive generations of Cubans in Miami indicated that those speakers of the upper middle class used and maintained Spanish to a slightly greater degree than those speakers of the lower middle class. This conclusion would suggest that any findings with respect to language maintenance which might be generalized to the wider population must include a representative sample of speakers from distinct socioeconomic backgrounds (lower, middle and upper). This notion is in keeping with the basic sociolinguistic methodology developed by Labov (1972). As this factor clearly conditions variability to a substantial degree in world Spanish, it was decided that the scope of the present study be limited to one socioeconomic class; since the
majority of Miami's Cubans are considered middle class (Boswell & Skop 1995), these speakers were selected for this analysis.³

The size of the present sample, comprising only thirty speakers, is also a limitation. A more comprehensive study would include a much larger number of speakers and include subjects from various national ethnic backgrounds. In such a study however, dialectal variation would need to be taken into careful consideration, since mood selection in Nicaraguan Spanish, for example, may manifest somewhat different patterns of variability than in Cuban Spanish.

I pointed out that sixteen of the thirty speakers included in the present investigation were enrolled in the first level of a Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) course at the University of Miami. The choice to study Spanish at the university level may possibly have had an impact on the results of this investigation since those who study Spanish in college may be more motivated than the general population to maintain their heritage language. It seems unlikely, however, that the patterns of simplification found in the verb system of these speakers would deviate greatly from the general second and third generation bilingual population of middle-class Cuban background living in Miami. All sixteen of these speakers reported that they principally enrolled in SNS not because of personal interest nor intrinsic motivation to pursue academic Spanish, but rather to fulfill the two-semester second language requirement mandated by the University of Miami. Notwithstanding, the inclusion of university

---
³ The total corpus of data collected in the present project was not limited to middle-class Cubans. Nearly sixty speakers were interviewed, some from what may be considered the lower class and others from what may be considered the upper class, although the vast majority could be classified as middle class. Additionally, second and third generation speakers of Nicaraguan, Honduran, Salvadoran, Colombian, Venezuelan, Puerto Rican, Dominican, Peruvian, and Ecuadoran backgrounds were order to control for a variety of variables conditioned by geographic and national spaces in modern-day Spanish.
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students in this investigation limits the ability to generalize the findings to the wider population of Cuban Miami.

It is extremely important to point out that precision in subjunctive usage is, in some discourse contexts and registers, closely related to the speaker's level of educational attainment. As such, it would be necessary in a future study to consider carefully the variability perhaps conditioned by this factor. We may also consider this factor as a limitation to making comparisons between the present study completed in Miami and the one carried out by Silva-Corvalán (1994a, 1994b) in Los Angeles. The majority of the second and third generation speakers included in the present analysis were college-enrolled, or had some postsecondary education. This was not the case of Silva-Corvalán's Los Angeles sample.

A further limitation of the present methodology is the instrument used to observe subjunctive usage in the written mode. As I explained in Chapter Two, subjunctive usage is often conditioned by discourse-level pragmatic factors (cf. Lavanda 1983, Lunn 1989). For this reason, it is important that mood distinction be analyzed in contextual, discourse length writing. The purpose of including a sentence completion task in the present study was, as I explained in Chapter Four, to provide an additional measure which would perhaps capture in writing those forms which had not occurred in oral discourse, or which had occurred only sporadically. As such, the task was aimed at eliciting a wide variety of morphological forms in a very condensed space, at the expense of offering a broader discourse context. A more comprehensive study would analyze subjunctive and indicative usage in more open-ended, contextualized discourse, such as paragraph-length responses to a variety of opinion questions or issues of debate (e.g. the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal).
As a final word, it seems essential that I elaborate, if only briefly, on the nature of bilingualism as a theoretical construct. It must certainly be considered a limitation of the present inquiry that those individuals whose speech collectively defined the ‘norm’ of the present variety (or first generation speech) were themselves not bilinguals in the more restricted sense of the word. Indeed, seven of the ten reported that their productive skills in English were very limited or none.

Even though the methodology of the present study is in keeping with the tradition of sociolinguistic research on bilingualism, it seems ironic that any study on the topic compare the patterns of bilingual speech to those of monolingual speech. Romaine (1995) stated that “while it is clear that a reasonable account of bilingualism cannot be based on a theory which assumes monolingual competence as its frame of reference, it has not been appreciated how one might take bilingualism as the starting point and subsume monolingualism within it” (321). Romaine suggested that the fallacy of the theoretical approach to bilingualism is owed to the prominent intellectual paradigms which informed the early foundations of the field:

Western modes of thought bear the legacy of structuralism—the belief that an entity, whether it is a society, language, etc. can be viewed as a structured self-contained whole, an autonomous entity which is consistent with itself.... It is from this intellectual perspective that modern linguistic theory has been articulated and within it that much of the research on bilingualism has been conducted. (326)
Although I would consider it inappropriate to have placed the methodology of the present inquiry radically outside the framework of traditional research on bilingualism, I do hope that the reader bears in mind the intellectual misunderstandings sometimes invoked by the theoretical foundations of the field itself. I believe that, in methodological terms, linguistic research on Bilingual Miami need be in no less of a compromised position than sociological research on the same urban social complex, as explained by two leading sociological researchers on the city of Miami, Portes and Stepick (1993):

Social facts are not self-intelligible. Their interpretation depends on the cognitive frames in which they are placed, and these in turn are products of prior social interactions. Common meanings are arrived at when relevant audiences agree to stress certain aspects of a given phenomenon and interpret them on the basis of shared past experience. Existing ‘frames’ of what American urban life is like, including those elaborated in the sociological research literature, prove to be of limited utility for rendering events in South Florida understandable. (9)

Hopefully, future research will open new insights into just how unique the immigrant situation of Miami actually proves to be in the history of the United States, both in the sociological and linguistic senses.

5. Directions for future research
I believe that the most promising future research pursuit which has come from the present sociolinguistic endeavor is the theoretical and empirical concept of "recontact" in processes of intergenerational Spanish language maintenance in Miami. As stated earlier, many
second and third generation speakers of the present sample who demonstrated extremely high levels of Spanish proficiency attributed their abilities to family members, friends, romantic interests and work partners who were either monolinguals or Spanish-dominant bilinguals. Research on the social networks (cf. Milroy 1982, Milroy & Milroy 1985, Stoessel 1998) of these speakers in conjunction with measures of discourse ability such as the present one would offer valuable insights into the cross-generational future of Spanish in Miami.

Further research on the verb system of successive generations of Spanish speakers in Miami could prove interesting as well. Argumentative discourse and hypothetical discourse, in their written and oral modes, are rich grounds for uncovering a number of complex cognitive and linguistic variables and processes in the social contact situation, yet as Silva-Corvalán (1994b) affirmed, "not much attention has been paid to conversational discourse which refers to hypothetical situations nor to argumentation in studies of language attrition" (76-77). This area of inquiry holds important pedagogical implications since SNS instructors are faced with the challenge of identifying the most effective and efficient ways to develop students' productive discourse skills in formal, academic argumentation and elaboration of abstract concepts.

As a phenomenon within itself, the metropolitan area of Miami deserves much further attention from researchers in the fields of Spanish in the U.S., bilingualism, language contact, sociology, anthropology, education, and cultural studies. Miami represents a complex bilingual, bicultural social situation unique in the modern sociolinguistic landscape of the United States and Latin America. The prestige attached to the Spanish language and the broad societal
acceptance of its everyday use alongside English in present-day Miami are phenomena well worthy of future investigation. Empirical research on attitudes toward the Spanish and English languages in the Miami context should be carried out in the coming years (Lynch & Klee 1999), as well as comparative studies focused on Miami and other principal U.S. urban areas of Spanish-speaking concentration (Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, New York, etc.). The value of Spanish in business and the workplace, and the personal economic worth attached to being bilingual in Miami must be empirically addressed as well (Boswell 1999).

All of these empirical and theoretical research endeavors into the sociolinguistic situation of Spanish in Miami must strive to encompass a wider sample of the Spanish-speaking population there, accounting for diverse educational, socioeconomic, racial, and national ethnic backgrounds. Gender differences should also be explored.

In Chapter Three, I quoted Portes and Stepick (1993), who maintain that "the multilingual, multicultural experiment that is Miami holds important lessons for what the American city will be about in a changed world." I believe that this city also holds extremely important sociolinguistic lessons for what the American city will be about far past the year 2000, beyond the "1.5 generation," and beyond the Cuban-origin population.

6. Pedagogical implications
Aparicio (1993) pointed out that "in its social and individual dynamics, bilingualism has become an increasingly complex issue, a matter of serious consequences for U.S. Latinos. Within the present political frame, the teaching of Spanish to Latino Bilinguals becomes an imperative practice at institutions of higher education" (183). Within
the highly dynamic bilingual context of Miami, I would concur in that the formal teaching of Spanish to successive generations is imperative. However imperative, the pedagogical practice itself is an extremely intricate issue which remains unresolved (Valdés, Lozano & García-Moya 1981, Roca 1990, 1997a, Valdés 1995a).

At both the local and national levels, questions of how to determine and design the most appropriate curriculum for these students of diverse dialectal backgrounds and highly disparate levels of Spanish language proficiency remain. Inherent in this debate has been the question of choosing a "standard variety" of Spanish for the instruction of U.S. bilinguals (cf. Villa 1996, Colombi & Alarcón 1997). Roca (1997b) pointed out that the great majority of studies from the field of U.S. Spanish Heritage Speaker pedagogy have focused on the linguistic and social situation of Mexican and Puerto Rican-origin bilinguals. She highlighted the value of future studies which would attempt to make connections and/or determine the differences between the linguistic situations of the three principal groups of Spanish speakers in the U.S.: Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban-Americans (Roca 1997b: 57).

I believe that the present dissertation has been one such study which makes a contribution toward understanding, comparatively, the situations of Spanish-English bilinguals of different ethnic backgrounds, in different sociolinguistic contexts in the modern U.S. This study has provided the field with some documented empirical knowledge, albeit minimal, into the linguistic processes affecting the Spanish verb system of Miami Cuban bilinguals, the majority Hispanic group found in this urban setting, and has attempted to compare the present general findings to the general findings of Silva-Corvalán's
(1994b) study of the Spanish verb system of Los Angeles Mexican-American bilinguals, the majority Hispanic group in that city.

Comparison of the present study with that of Silva-Corvalán (1994b) brings to light the importance of addressing local level needs in the Spanish for Native Speakers (SNS) curriculum. It appears that for many second and third generation Los Angeles Mexicans, subjunctive instruction must begin with rudimentary explanation of the mood distinction system in World Spanish, much as it would in the Spanish foreign language classroom designed for non-native speakers. On the other hand, for most second and third generation Miami Cubans, the bulk of subjunctive instruction seems more appropriately aimed at developing the forms and functions of the past subjunctive and the perfect subjunctive in both oral and written discourse.

The present data suggested that some second and third generation speakers who confidently made mood distinctions in past and present tenses in speech became more uncertain when faced with putting the forms in writing. Indeed, I observed in Chapter Five that the frequency of the indicative in categorical contexts of usage was higher in the written data than in the oral data (where its occurrence was extremely restricted). As such, there is a clear need in the Miami SNS classroom to focus on developing all forms and tenses of the subjunctive in written discourse.

The findings of the present investigation may contribute toward a more comprehensive definition of what Valdés (1995a) has called the "bilingual range" in SNS classrooms. She described the problem in the following way:

Bilingual range encompasses different kinds of competencies in two languages including... grammatical, textual, illocutionary, and sociolinguistic competence.... Currently, there is much that
we do not know about bilingual range and about why and how communicative abilities and other language competencies in bilinguals appear to shift in unpredictable ways. We know even less about how these abilities and competencies might be strengthened.

I maintain that the present evidence indicates that the subjunctive mood in Miami Cuban Spanish is, in terms of comparing it with World Spanish, substantially reduced. Since mood and hypotheticality are valuable stylistic elements of formal and academic speech and writing in World Spanish, the subjunctive forms and functions must be carefully addressed in the SNS classroom.

Recalling what I explained in Chapter Two, the subjunctive mood is often used to express quite subtle pragmatic meanings, e.g. relevance, previously known information, etc. It seems to me that these sorts of subjunctive usage are best developed among SNS students through reading and writing, and in oral discourse through such tasks as argumentative debates. It is thus essential that the SNS classroom, irrespective of its local setting, be communicatively oriented (cf. Nuevos Mundos, Roca's (1999) recently published communicative-based course for U.S. Hispanic bilinguals). The present study has demonstrated that Spanish-English bilingual speakers included in this sample associate with the subjunctive a quite complex array of semantic and pragmatic values in oral discourse, values which are not inherent in context-reduced tasks such as the written sentence completion task included in the present investigation. Broader-level discourse which serves the function of communication, I believe, is necessary to further develop mood distinction and hypotheticality among bilingual speakers.
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Appendix 1

RECRUITMENT LETTER

Andrew Lynch and Elena Grau-Lleveria of the Dept. of Foreign Languages of the University of Miami are conducting a research study among Hispanic-background Spanish-English bilinguals in the Miami metropolitan area. The purpose of the study is to analyze certain characteristics of the written and oral Spanish discourse of Hispanic bilinguals in Miami, along with their self-reported language use and attitudes toward Spanish and English in order to address the issue of Spanish language maintenance and implications for Spanish Native/Heritage-speaker education.

If you are originally from a Spanish-speaking country or if you are of second or third generation Spanish-speaking descent born in the U.S., you are invited to participate in the study. If you agree to participate, we would ask you to do the following: 1) complete a 30-60 minute tape-recorded informal interview with the investigator, Andrew Lynch, during which you would talk a bit about your linguistic and educational background, and be asked to talk in Spanish about your daily life in Miami, and offer your ideas and opinions about some general social, political and cultural issues; 2) complete a short written task to test your basic knowledge of vocabulary and verb usage in Spanish; and 3) complete a brief questionnaire, individually, which seeks to measure the extent of your daily use of Spanish and your attitudes toward Spanish and English. Your time commitment would be 1 to 2 hours total (30-60 minute interview, 15-30 minutes for written task, 15-30 minutes for questionnaire), and you could complete these three sections of the study in one block of time, or choose to complete different sections on different days, as you wish.

There is no risk to being involved in the study. The records of the study will be kept private and confidential. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Your participation is strictly voluntary and you will receive no rewards or compensations, academic or financial. This research is in no way related to your course grade in a Spanish for Native Speakers course now or in the future. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with your current instructor, or any member of any academic department at this University or any other university. By being part of the study, however, you will be contributing significantly to our knowledge of the sociolinguistic situation of Hispanic bilinguals in Miami, as relevant to debate in the spheres of academic research and educational methodology for Native/Heritage speakers of Spanish in the U.S.

If you are willing to participate, please contact Andrew Lynch at the University of Miami at 305-284-4858, ext. 8-7242.

Sincerely,

Elena Grau-Lleveria and Andrew Lynch
Dept. of Foreign Languages, University of Miami
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CONSENT FORM

Spanish Language Usage among Miami Hispanic Bilinguals

You are invited to be in a research study analyzing the use of Spanish and language attitudes among Spanish-English bilinguals in the Miami area. You were selected as a possible participant because you identified yourself as a bilingual speaker in response to the letter which you previously received from the lead investigators, Andrew Lynch and Elena Grau-Llervera of the Dept. of Foreign Languages at University of Miami. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

The purpose of this study is to analyze certain characteristics of the written and oral Spanish discourse of Spanish-English bilinguals in Miami, along with their self-reported language use and attitudes toward Spanish and English in order to address the issue of language maintenance and/or loss and implications for Spanish Native/Heritage-speaker education in the Miami area.

If you agree to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following: 1) complete a 60-90 minute tape-recorded informal oral interview with the investigator, Andrew Lynch, during which you would discuss a bit about your linguistic and educational background, and be asked to talk in Spanish about your daily life in Miami, and offer your ideas and opinions about some general social and cultural issues; 2) complete a short written task to test your basic knowledge of vocabulary and verb usage in Spanish; and 3) complete a brief questionnaire, individually, which seeks to measure the extent of your daily use of Spanish and your ideas and attitudes toward Spanish and English. Your time commitment would be about 2 to 3 hours total (60-90 minute oral interview, 15-30 minutes for written task, 15-30 minutes for questionnaire), and you could complete these three sections of the study in one block of time, or choose to complete different sections on different days, as you wish.

There is no risk to being involved in the study. Your participation is strictly voluntary and you will receive no rewards or compensations, be they academic or financial. By being part of the study, however, you will be contributing to our knowledge of the linguistic situation of Hispanic bilinguals in Miami, as relevant to debate in the spheres of academic research and educational methodology for Native/Heritage Speakers of Spanish in the U.S.

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be kept in a lock file; only the researchers will have access to the records. Tape recordings from the oral interviews will be used only for research purposes by the investigator. They will be kept indefinitely.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your course grade nor your current or future relations with your current instructor, or any member of any academic department at this University or any other university. If you decide to
participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

The researchers conducting this study are Andrew Lynch and Elena Grau-Lleveria. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact Andrew Lynch at 305-284-4858, ext. 8-7242, or Elena Grau-Lleveria at 305-284-4858, ext. 8-7261. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact Maria Arnold, Institutional Review Board Administrator, at 305-243-3327.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Statement of consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature_________________________________________ Date________

Signature of Investigator___________________________ Date________
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ORAL INTERVIEW GUIDE QUESTIONS

1. nombre, edad
2. ¿Dónde naciste? ¿De dónde son tus padres? tus abuelos?
3. ¿Cuándo viniste a EE.UU.? ¿Cuándo vinieron tus padres a EE.UU? tus abuelos?
4. ¿Qué lengua hablaste primero--español o inglés? ¿Usas español en casa? de niño/a?
5. ¿Aprendiste español en la escuela? ¿Dónde asististe a la escuela primaria? secundaria? ¿Recibiste educación bilingüe?
6. Describe a tu familia un poco. ¿Con quién(es) hablas español? ¿Con quién(es) hablas inglés normalmente? ¿Quién es la persona más "interesante" de tu familia? Describela.
7. (if not born in Miami) ¿Cuándo viniste a Miami? ¿Cuáles fueron tus primeras impresiones de la ciudad?
8. ¿Por qué decidiste asistir a la Universidad de Miami?
9. ¿Qué te gusta de la Universidad de Miami? Qué no te gusta? Qué cambiarías en la Universidad si tuvieras el control de hacerlo? Qué le recomendarías al presidente de la Universidad?
10. ¿Qué habrías hecho si no hubieras decidido asistir a la Universidad de Miami?
11. ¿Vives en el campus? or ¿Cómo es tu vecindario? ¿Cómo es un día "típico" para ti? ¿Usas mucho español en tus interacciones con otras personas?
12. ¿Cómo era el vecindario donde vivías de niño? ¿Hay/había mucha gente allí que habla/ba español? Describe un lugar ideal para vivir, en tu opinión.
13. Completa esta afirmación: Yo me mudaría de Miami si....
15. ¿Piensas que Miami es una verdadera ciudad "bilingüe"? ¿Cómo ves las divisiones sociales entre el inglés y el español en Miami?
16. ¿Qué crees que pasaría si el uso del español fuera prohibido en todo Miami?
17. ¿Crees que alguien te discriminó alguna vez por ser hispana/o o por hablar español? Qué pasó?
18. ¿Crees que se le hace difícil a la persona que no hable inglés vivir aquí en Miami? Las personas que sólo hablan español sufren mucha discriminación acá?
19. Si tuvieras la oportunidad, ¿visitarías Cuba? ¿Qué harías allí?
¿Cuáles serían los aspectos positivos de tal visita?
20. Si Castro perdiera control de Cuba mañana, ¿cómo respondería la comunidad cubana en Miami? ¿Piensas que mucha gente regresaría a Cuba?
21. Completá esta afirmación: Cuba estaría en mejores condiciones hoy sí...
¿Cuál es tu opinión sobre la relación política entre EE.UU y Cuba?
22. ¿Piensas que saldrías con alguien o te casarías con alguien que no fuera cubano? que no fuera hispano? que no hablara español? ¿Cómo reaccionaría tu familia?
23. Describe a tu pareja ideal.
24. ¿Te casarías o te comprometerías con alguien que fuera de otra raza u otra religión? ¿Cómo reaccionaría tu familia?
25. ¿Qué esperas que puedas lograr en los próximos diez años?
26. Completa esta afirmación: Cuando me gradúe quiero encontrar un trabajo que...
(Describe un trabajo/una carrera ideal para el futuro. ¿Qué tipo de trabajo quieres?)
27. ¿Qué harías si ganaras la lotería?
28. ¿Qué quieres para tus hijos cuando ellos sean adultos? ¿Será importante el español para tus hijos?
29. ¿Qué esperaban tus padres de ti cuando eras niña/o?
30. ¿Qué dudas tienes respecto al futuro?
31. ¿De que estás seguro para el futuro?

Eventos actuales (current affairs):

32. ¿Estás de acuerdo con que el Presidente Clinton deba resignar por el escándalo Lewinsky? ¿Cuál es tu opinión? En su situación, ¿qué harías?
33. ¿Crees que algún día un hispano llegue a ser presidente de EE.UU.? una mujer? ¿Votarías por una mujer para la presidencia?
34. ¿Cuál es tu opinión respecto al movimiento English Only en EE.UU? ¿Cuál crees que es el propósito de ese movimiento?
35. ¿Cuál es tu opinión sobre la importancia o la falta de importancia de los programas de educación bilingüe para niños en las escuelas públicas en EE.UU?
36. ¿Es verdad que la violencia en la televisión y las películas les afecta a los niños?
37. ¿Es un problema la violencia en las escuelas aquí en Miami? y las drogas?
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SENTENCE COMPLETION TASK
(Spanish for Native Speakers courses)

Complete las siguientes oraciones.

1. Pienso que es bueno que los hispanos en Estados Unidos
2. Los inmigrantes hispanos en los Estados Unidos deben aprender inglés para que
3. Es útil ser bilingüe en Miami, no importa donde
4. Hablaría más español en mi vida diaria si
5. Mis padres siempre han querido que yo
6. Cuando era niño/a creía que
7. Ahora me alegro de que yo
8. Yo quiero que mis hijos
9. Es importante que los niños
10. No creo que las escuelas en los Estados Unidos
11. Es mejor que los niños bilingües en Estados Unidos
12. En Miami, me gusta que
13. En Miami, no me gusta que
14. Yo me mudaría de Miami si
15. Es necesario que los políticos en Estados Unidos
16. Yo votaría por una mujer para la presidencia si
17. El mejor presidente es el que
18. Si fuera presidente/a de la nación, yo
19. Mis padres siempre esperaban que yo
20. De niño, yo dudaba que
21. Ahora sé que yo
22. Para el futuro no sé si
23. Voy a terminar mi carrera universitaria aunque
24. En el futuro quiero un trabajo que
25. Despúes de graduarme de la Universidad, dudo que
26. Me iré de vacaciones cuando
27. Voy a comprar un carro nuevo tan pronto como
28. Compraré una casa cuando
29. De viejo/a, es posible que yo
30. De viejo/a, es seguro que yo
31. Toda mi vida yo he esperado que