Kansas Working Papers
in
Linguistics

edited by

Stacey Stowers
Nathan Poell

Volume 26
2002

Cover design by Nathan Poell and Stacey Stowers

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics
Volume 26
2002

SPANISH PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE USAGE
BY U.S. SPANISH HERITAGE SPEAKERS

Kristi Hislope
North Georgia College & State University

Abstract: This study is a descriptive, qualitative focus-on-form
case study of the written production and recognition skills of the
Spanish present subjunctive of ten heritage speakers enrolled in a
Spanish class. A pre-test and two posttests were given to
determine if a Spanish reading selection containing an input flood
of the present subjunctive would effect the participants' skills in
recognizing and producing the form in cloze passages and if there
would be long-term retention of the form. Results indicate
sporadic written use of the form after exposure to the treatment and
lower or similar scores on the recognition task both before and
after the treatment.

Introduction

   Very few research studies have focussed specifically on Spanish language
heritage speakers at the college or university level. The need for such studies is
increasing as more heritage speakers enroll in Spanish foreign language courses.
The present study is a descriptive, qualitative focus-on-form case study of the
written production and recognition skills of the Spanish present subjunctive of ten
heritage speakers enrolled in Spanish courses at Purdue University. The present
subjunctive was focussed on because it is generally recognized that in varieties of
US Spanish there is an increased use of the indicative mood in contexts where the
subjunctive would normally occur in 'standard' Spanish. Torreblanca (1997:137)
claims that US Spanish is following the popular tendency of a language to
morphologically simplify. Silva-Corvalán (1994) also agrees. She defines
simplification as 'a complex process involving the expansion of a form to a larger
number of contexts (i.e. generalization) at the expense of a form undergoing
simplification, which is used with increasingly lower frequency' (257).

Previous Studies on the Subjunctive

Ocampo (1990) conducted a study on three bilingual generations of Chicano Spanish speakers in East Los Angeles to determine mood selection. He found that in obligatory contexts the first generation produced the subjunctive 100% of the time while the second generation used it 91% and the third generation used it only 62% (48). In those contexts where both the subjunctive and indicative may occur, Ocampo (1990:48) reported the following percentages of subjunctive usage: first generation 70%, second generation 60%, and third generation 22%. Ocampo (1990:45) concludes that for the third generation the subjunctive in variable contexts ' ... almost does not constitute an option ... It has lost the semantic matrices that distinguished it from the indicative' (translation mine). He goes on to say that the use of the subjunctive in the required contexts 'is governed only by formal restrictions; the semantic aspect no longer plays any role' (translation mine) (45). He suggests that at this rate, the final outcome is complete loss of the subjunctive (45).

Silva-Corvalán (1994), in another study on East Los Angeles Spanish, found that the subjunctive is not being used as often in the third generation. In the assertive and nonassertive syntactic contexts that Silva-Corvalán (1994:265) studied, the distribution of the subjunctive was 42.4% in the first generation, and 26.5% and 17.3% for the second and third generations respectively. She notes that for all three generations the contexts where the subjunctive is retained the most is in the obligatory categories of volitional, purpose clauses, and concessive clauses (i.e. *querer* 'to want', *para que* 'in order that', and *aunque* 'although' respectively) (265). The frequency of the subjunctive occurring in obligatory contexts is 93.8% for the first generation, 74.2% for the second generation, and 52.5% for the third generation (267). These results differ substantially from Ocampo's (1990:48) findings of 100%, 91%, and 62% for each generation in the same context. The interesting percentage to note is Silva-Corvalán's (1994:267) 93.8% use for the first generation in obligatory contexts. This statistic demonstrates that it is not only the second and third generations that are experiencing reduced usage of the subjunctive. Silva-Corvalán (1994:267-8) states that this ' ... indicates that the seeds of change are to be found in the basically monolingual communities of origin.'

Whereas Ocampo (1990:45) says that the subjunctive mood will eventually be lost, Silva-Corvalán (1994:269) states that there is 'no evidence in Los Angeles that the mood opposition will be obliterated.' However, she does acknowledge the possibility that 'the selection of subjunctive may become solely dependent on morpho-syntactic and lexical features of the context' (269). Thus, the subjunctive may become a grammaticalization where the use of the indicative in the same phrase would be meaningless to the speaker.

Gutiérrez (1994) analyzed the subjunctive in the speech of monolinguals from Michoacán, Mexico. In those contexts where the subjunctive was required, Gutiérrez (1994:116) found the three generations used it 93%, 94%, and 96% of the time respectively. Although these numbers vary slightly, it is noteworthy that the third generation used the subjunctive in required contexts more than the first generation. This is the opposite of what both Ocampo (1990) and Silva-Corvalán (1994) found. In the variable contexts where both moods may be used, the subjunctive was present 89%, 76%, and 77% for each generation indicating a possible decrease in usage of the subjunctive among younger speakers (Gutiérrez 1994:116-7). He claims that more data are needed to confirm this possibility though (117). Thus, we see a slight decrease in the use of the subjunctive in a monolingual setting.

Silva-Corvalán (1994:268) states that 'the phenomenon of gradual loss of mood distinctions ... represents part of an evolutionary trend in Spanish and other Romance languages.' She lists several standard varieties of Spanish such as Argentinean, Mexican, Paraguayan, Uruguayan, and Venezuelan that are in the process of simplification of subjunctive forms (268). Rojas Anadón (1979) in a study of university students from Panama, Peru, Chile, Ecuador, and Colombia also found a reduction in subjunctive use and concluded that 'the subjunctive is slowly disappearing from the Spanish spoken in Latin America' (translation mine). However, Silva-Corvalán (1994:270) points out that the process of simplification 'is not abrupt: it does not occur in all possible contexts at once ... The diffusion is gradual and context-selective ... ' In the case of Chicano Spanish, the internally motivated change that is already in progress in monolingual varieties has been accelerated perhaps because of language contact with English (Silva-Corvalán 1994:268, Gutiérrez 1994:121, Colombi 1997:181).

The amount of exposure that each subsequent generation has with the Spanish language seems to be a major factor in the loss of the subjunctive mood.

Focus-on-Form

Because of the subjunctive's decrease in usage, the researcher chose to perform a focus-on-form (FonF) experiment with the focus being on the simple present subjunctive paradigm in Spanish. Williams and Evans (1998:139) define FonF as ' ... instruction that draws learners' attention to form in the context of meaningful communication.' Sanz (2000:17) argues, 'Focus on Form does not mean we are going back to the drill and kill classroom because FonF does not imply constant, indiscriminate grammar explanation and practice. FonF means precisely the opposite: setting limits on what is explicitly taught.'

In implicit FonF, 'the aim is to *attract* learner attention and to avoid metalinguistic discussion, always *minimizing any interruption* to the communication of meaning' whereas in explicit FonF, 'the aim is to *direct* learner attention and to *exploit pedagogical grammar* in this regard' (Doughty and Williams 1998:232). Leow (2000) (cited in Lee and Valdman 2000:xiv) claims that ' ... research indicates implicit procedures for awareness ... prove to be less effective in accelerating acquisition and advancing language development than a variety of types of explicit approaches.' Doughty and Williams (1998) claim the opposite. They state, ' ... it is sometimes possible to aim more or less implicitly to attract the learner's attention to linguistic features and promote the processing of these features without providing any sort of explicit guidance ... ' (236).

An implicit FonF technique, written input flooding was used in the present study in order to investigate subjunctive usage and recognition in a more naturalistic environment. In this technique, participants are subjected to an excessive number of tokens of the grammar form being investigated. Other implicit techniques use writing enhancement (bolding, underlining, italics, etc.) to draw the participants' attention to the form without explicitly instructing them on usage rules. The researcher wanted to investigate any changes that heritage speakers would experience in subjunctive usage after being exposed to an input flood in a reading treatment. It was felt that this technique more closely reproduces the reading conditions that these participants might be exposed to in

everyday life. In other words, the present subjunctive forms were not highlighted in any way because this does not occur in any natural reading the participants may do on their own. The effectiveness of this technique is controversial. According to Tomlin and Villa (1994:197), ' ... input flooding ... might be sufficient to cue the learner to orient to the appropriate formal differences, thus making particular grammatical relationships easier to detect.' However, Williams and Evans (1998:141) believe that an input flood alone may not be enough to get students to notice grammatical items. Schmidt (1990:143) has argued that what gets noticed relies heavily on task demands. Therefore, being instructed to look consciously for rules may prove to make a difference in long-term learning. On the other hand, DeKeyser (1995) found that implicit learning was not superior to explicit learning of complex rules. Most agree that the focus should be on forms that are difficult to acquire. Sanz (2000:17) agrees and lists the Spanish subjunctive as an ideal candidate.

Methodology

Before beginning the experiment participants filled out a questionnaire which elicited confidential information about family and language background, reading and writing practices in both Spanish and English, language self-assessments, language attitudes, and miscellaneous information related to language, language usage or their Spanish classes.

The participants were given three grammar oriented exercises which were developed by the researcher: A pre-test, an immediate posttest, and a delayed posttest. Each test consists of the same cloze exercises to test production skills and a multiple choice exercise to test recognition skills (see Appendix for samples). In the cloze activities participants had to fill in the correct form of the supplied infinitive. The multiple choice exercise consisted of a Spanish sentence with two English translations. The participants had to choose the translation that best expressed the idea of the Spanish sentence. Thus, the sentences were not direct translations, but tapped into the meaning of each sentence depending on how the participant interpreted the Spanish present subjunctive into English. In both activities, the imperfect versus preterite aspect distinction was tested to serve as a distractor.

The pre-test was administered on the second day of the experiment. This test served as a baseline to evaluate participant performance before being given the treatment. Three weeks later, participants were given the treatment which was a four page magazine article taken from a Spanish language textbook. It was chosen for both its familiar topic (an adolescent's relationship with his/her father) and fairly easy reading level as well as an unnaturally high occurrence (47 tokens) of the present subjunctive in the article. After reading the article, participants completed the immediate posttest. It is different from the other tests in that it contains reading comprehension questions. These questions were used as distractors. The immediate posttest serves as an instrument to gauge any possible effects due to the input flood in the treatment. The delayed posttest occurred on the final day of the experiment three weeks after the immediate posttest. This test serves as a means to see if a long-term recall effect occurs after receiving the treatment. The researcher compared the responses of each test for each participant to determine what differences, if any, occurred in their responses.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses guided the present study:

1 Does implicit focus on the present subjunctive through an input flood in a reading passage elicit 'written production of the form' in the immediate posttest? Is there a long-term recall effect as determined through the delayed posttest?

It was hypothesized that immediately after receiving the treatment, the participants' written production of the present subjunctive would be higher than before receiving the input flood but there would be no long-term recall of the form. In other words, participants would 'forget' anything gained by the time of the delayed posttest.

2 Does implicit focus on the present subjunctive through an input flood in a reading passage elicit 'recognition of the form' in the immediate posttest? Is there a long-term effect on recognition of the form as determined through the delayed posttest?

It was hypothesized that there would be no or little effect on the participants' recognition skills of the Spanish present subjunctive. These hypotheses are based on the notions of declarative versus procedural knowledge (Anderson 1995). Declarative knowledge is factual knowledge. Procedural knowledge encodes behavior or alerts the learner what should be done under certain circumstances. With fully automatized procedural knowledge, the learner does not have to think about what they are doing in order to do it. Declarative knowledge is not necessarily a prerequisite for procedural knowledge. If the target behavior (or procedure) is engaged in enough, then this behavior is proceduralized. In the present experimental situation, hypotheses were drawn on the notion that heritage speakers have declarative knowledge of the present subjunctive (thus their hypothesized ability to recognize the form) but have not proceduralized that knowledge (thus their hypothesized inability to produce the form in writing in the long-term).

Participants

Participants were recruited from first through eighth semester Spanish by requesting that teachers supply the names and phone numbers of students they suspected were heritage speakers. The researcher then contacted each student, determined if they were heritage speakers, and described the research as a reading study. They were told participation was purely voluntary and would not effect their Spanish course grade. Ten heritage speakers volunteered for the study. They are identified as M (male) or F (female). All participants from the northern Indiana / Chicago area except for F5 who is from West Los Angeles. M1, F3, and F4 are of Puerto Rican heritage and all other participants are of Mexican heritage. Table 1 lists the participants' age, Spanish class enrolled in, whether they consider themselves native Spanish speakers or not, self-ratings on their reading ability in Spanish on a scale of one (low reading ability) to four (high ability), and whether they claim to have received instruction in the Spanish present subjunctive. To determine familiarity with the present subjunctive, the participants were asked on the questionnaire if they had received instruction on the difference between *hablo* 'I talk, present indicative' and *que yo hable* 'that I may talk, present subjunctive.' No English translations or paradigm names were given so that participants would be less likely to look up the information in between test dates. This was the only method used to determine familiarity with the present subjunctive. As distractors,

participants were also questioned on imperfect/preterite and preterite/past subjunctive instruction.

Participant	Age	Spanish class enrolled in[1]	Native Spanish speaker?	Reading self-rating[2]	Subjunctive instruction?[3]
M1	21	241, 302	No	2	Yes
M2	20	301	Yes	3	No
M3	19	301	No	3	Yes
M4	30	201	Yes	2	Yes
M5	20	241, 301	Yes	3	Don't know
F1	19	301	No	4	Yes
F2	20	302	Yes	4	Don't know
F3	19	202	No	3	No
F4	20	401	Yes	4	No
F5	19	302	Yes	3	No

Table 1. Participants' Age, Level, Native Speaker Status, Self Assessed Reading Ability in Spanish, and Present Subjunctive Familiarity.

They were also asked what types of materials they read in Spanish and how often they read them to determine any possible relationships between reading and subjunctive usage. Only M2 reported doing no reading in Spanish. F3 reported reading magazines in Spanish monthly. The other participants reported reading newspapers, books and letters/cards from family members anywhere from daily to monthly.

Analysis of Written Production

Table 2 lists the numbers of subjunctive forms that each participant produced correctly from the pre-test (PreT), immediate posttest (ImPT), and delayed posttest (DelPT) as well as their total percentages. These numbers represent the correct forms out of a total of 13 possible correct present subjunctive forms on the test. These numbers reflect the total number of correct subjunctives overall, not considering the participants' performance on one item over the three tests. Thus, F1's totals of 6 and 6 correct on the immediate posttest and the delayed posttest does not mean these were the same items on both tests. Patterns such as these are

reported in Table 3. It is noted again that each test had identical fill-in-the-blank
activities.

Part	PreT	ImPT	DelPT	Total # correct on all 3 tests	PreT%	ImPT%	DelPT%
M1	1	4	1	6	7.7	30.8	7.7
M2	6	5	8	19	46.2	38.5	61.5
M3	4	10	10	24	30.8	76.9	76.9
M4	0	4	2	6	0	30.8	15.4
M5	12	9	10	31	92.3	69.2	76.9
F1	3	6	6	15	23.1	46.2	46.2
F2	11	12	12	35	84.6	92.3	92.3
F3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F4	9	6	9	24	69.2	46.2	69.2
F5	10	9	11	30	76.9	69.2	84.6

Table 2. Number of Correct Subjunctive Forms Produced and Percentages.

It is important to note that no participants scored the total possible points on any
test. F2 has the highest total scores followed by M5 and then F5. These
participants all scored in the 30's out of a total of 39 possible total points. They
all consider themselves native speakers and F2 and M5 reported not knowing if
they had been instructed in the present subjunctive (Table 1). F5 reported that she
had been instructed in the form. It is interesting that the two participants scoring
the highest on the subjunctive forms did not report being instructed in it. It is
typical of native speakers not to be able to label the names of certain verbal
paradigms (e.g. present subjunctive, past perfect, etc.), however, they are able to
recognize acceptable verbs from their language. M4 is the lowest scoring
participant to consider himself a native Spanish speaker. Of the participants
considering themselves native, he also rates himself the lowest on reading ability
in Spanish with a two (Table 1). His low score may be attributed to his level of
Spanish class. He is in Spanish 201 (second year Spanish) which is the lowest
level of all the participants. However, he does report having received instruction
in the present subjunctive. The participant enrolled in the highest level course,
Spanish 401 (level VII) is F4. Her total number correct is 11 lower than the
highest scorer, F2 (24 correct compared to 35). The three highest scoring
participants report reading materials in Spanish quite often whereas the participant

scoring the lowest (F3) reports only reading Spanish magazines. However, M4 who scored a low total of 6 reports reading a lot in Spanish. Thus, the high scorers seem to show a positive relationship between reading and present subjunctive production, however these results cannot be generalized without a larger sample.

For all participants, the number of correct subjunctives on each test was a total of 56 in the pre-test, 65 in the immediate posttest, and 69 in the delayed posttest. These numbers do not support the hypothesis made, that there would not be any long-term retention as evidenced through the delayed posttest. However, there was a larger increase between the pre-test and immediate posttest than between the immediate posttest and delayed posttest (an increase of 9 versus only 4). It is surprising that the total number correct increased overtime, and the researcher cannot determine if these effects were from the experiment treatment or from other external factors such as classroom learning. Other patterns also emerged from the data. Two participants used the present subjunctive for a required indicative. M1 did this on two items only in the immediate posttest which leads the researcher to believe that M1 hypercorrected after the input flood. M3 used the subjunctive for the indicative in the pre-test and delayed posttest. M1 and F3 both used *era* ,the imperfect of *ser* 'to be', for *sea*, the present subjunctive, on both posttests whereas they used *es* 'it is', the indicative, on the pre-test. Perhaps the treatment triggered a change in production, but it just triggered the wrong change.

As for individual analysis of each participant, those following the expected pattern of showing an improvement of present subjunctive production in the immediate posttest with a lower score on the delayed posttest were only M1 and M4. Those showing sustained improvement in both posttests (they received the same score which was higher than their score on the pre-test) were M3, F1, and F2. F3 showed no improvement, scoring a 0 on all tests. The other participants (M2, M5, F4, F5) showed sporadic results. However, these four participants all did worse on producing the present subjunctive in the immediate posttest which is completely contrary to what the researcher hypothesized. It was expected that they would perform the best after having just been exposed to the form in the treatment reading. M2 and F5 received their highest score on the delayed posttest which could reflect classroom instruction, but this is not known to the researcher.

M5 received his highest score on the pretest which is completely unexplainable given that in a six week period he would have received more Spanish instruction whether that included subjunctive instruction or not. Perhaps he was studying the subjunctive during the pre-test and not during the other tests. F4 received a higher but equal score (9's) on the pre-test and delayed posttest.

In the preceding analysis, the participants' overall performance was compared on each test. In the remainder of this section, individual test items in the production tasks will be compared across all three tests for each participant. An in-depth item analysis revealed an array of occurring patterns. The researcher analyzed each participant's responses to each production test item in order to calculate how many items were produced correctly across all three tests or incorrectly across all three tests. During the analysis, seven patterns emerged from the data. The researcher grouped these patterns into five sets (as shown by the five columns in Table 3) to facilitate the analysis. The first two columns in Table 3 are items in which all forms were produced identically across all three tests (produced either all correctly or all incorrectly). The last three columns of Table 3 represent five different patterns which have been grouped into three patterns as follows:

	Pretest	Im Posttest	Del Posttest
1	incorrect	correct	incorrect
2	incorrect	correct	correct
3	correct	incorrect	correct
	correct	correct	incorrect
	correct	incorrect	incorrect

In pattern 1, the participant produced an item incorrectly on the pretest, correctly on the immediate posttest, and incorrectly on the delayed posttest. Pattern 1 may indicate an effect on that item due to the input flood treatment but having no long-term effect. In pattern 2, a particular item was produced incorrectly on the pretest but correctly on both of the posttests. Pattern 2 may indicate an effect after receiving the treatment and long-term retention. Pattern 3 reflects behaviors that are counterintuitive to that which the researcher anticipated. This pattern represents any item in which the present subjunctive was produced correctly in the pretest but incorrectly on one or both of the posttests. The researcher chose to

group these three patterns into one since they all reflect patterns which were not hypothesized. Correct responses were expected on both posttests if the item was answered correctly in the pretest. However, this did not occur for those items grouped into the third pattern (e.g. the last column of Table 3).

In Table 3, the number of items that follow the above patterns are tabulated as well as test items that were produced either all correctly or all incorrectly across all three tests.

Part	All items correct in all 3 tests	All items incorrect in all 3 tests	Pattern 1 Inc[3], Cor, Inc	Pattern 2 Inc, Cor, Cor	Pattern 3 Cor, at least one incorrect
M1	1	9	3	0	0
M2	3	3	1	1	2
M3	4	3	0	6	0
M4	0	9	2	2	0
M5	8	0	0	1	4
F1	2	5	2	2	1
F2	11	1	0	1	0
F3	0	13	0	0	0
F4	6	4	0	0	3
F5	8	1	1	0	2

Table 3. Number of Correct Subjunctive Forms by Item Following Set Patterns.

Thus, Table 3 shows that M1 had one test item in which he produced the correct present subjunctive form on all three of the tests. There were nine test items in which he did not produce any form correctly on any of the three tests. And finally, he had three items which followed the pattern of being produced incorrectly on the pre-test, correctly on the immediate posttest, and incorrectly on the delayed posttest. There were 13 total test items requiring the present subjunctive. The items in Table 3 do not add up to 13 for participants M2, F1, and F5. This is because they produced a different pattern for some test items such as 'inc., inc., cor.' Which cannot be explained fully by the researcher. One possible explanation is that participants were receiving classroom instruction in the Spanish present subjunctive during the time the delayed posttest was administered and, thus, their awareness of the form may have been heightened.

A closer look at column two in Table 3 (all items incorrect) reveals that only one participant, M5, produced zero items incorrectly on the three tests. This means that M5 is the only participant that had at least one of the three occurrences (pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest) of each test item correct. It is disturbing that the numbers of all items incorrect on all three tests are quite high for some participants. For example, F3 produced no correct forms on any test. (She has a score of 13 for 'all items incorrect' in Table 3). Her high score of incorrect items is followed by M1 and M4 who both had nine items in which the present subjunctive was never produced correctly on any test. For these two participants, nine of thirteen items, or 69.2% of the subjunctive items were produced incorrectly. Again, M4 is in the lowest level Spanish course of the participants, but considers himself a native Spanish speaker. M1 considers himself to be a non-native speaker.

M4 and F3 did not have any test items in which the present subjunctive was produced correctly in all three tests, as they both scored a zero on the pre-test for present subjunctive forms. For F3 the treatment seemed to have no effect on her production since she scored zeros on both of the posttests. However, for M4 there was a slight improvement in score, perhaps from exposure to the input flood treatment. He had two items with a short-term effect (correct only on the immediate posttest) and two items with a long-term effect (correct on both posttests).

Pattern one, incorrect present subjunctive formation on the pre-test followed by correct and then incorrect present subjunctive on the posttests, was hypothesized to be the most frequently occurring. Five participants show this pattern but with a very low occurrence. M1 had three test items which followed this pattern. M4 and F1 had two items following this pattern while M2 and F5 had only one item following this pattern. Of these five participants, only M1 and M4 do not have test items which follow pattern three. Although they both have a large number of items incorrect on all three tests (they both scored 9 in column two of Table 3), they both show promise in improvement after the treatment and M4 showed long-term improvement (pattern two).

Pattern two is the most encouraging, showing improvement in present subjunctive production over a longer period of time. M3 excels over the other participants in this pattern with a total of six items. Five other participants follow this pattern, although with a much smaller frequency. Of the six participants performing with pattern two behavior, three of them (M2, M5, and F1) also have items exhibiting the problematic pattern three.

Pattern three, in which the present subjunctive was produced correctly on the pretest and then incorrectly on one or both of the posttests, presents a problematic profile in claiming any effects on an input flood treatment. M5, who has a fairly high score on all items correct in all three tests (eight items), has four items in which production was correct in the pre-test and not in the posttests. F4 and F5 both have fairly high numbers of all-correct items (six and eight items respectively) with some items in pattern three (three and two items respectively). One possible explanation for the grouped patterns occurring within pattern three is that participants' attention was not focused on the verbal paradigm under investigation but was focused on passage content and, therefore, participants did not attend to grammatical information. Another possible explanation is that participants were studying the present subjunctive in their classrooms during the pre-test and, thus, were more aware of the form at that time. These explanations seem typical of what may happen with non-native learners of Spanish. Much of the data in the present study seem to lead to the conclusion that present subjunctive usage for some U.S. Spanish speakers is sporadic which may be the case when a form is in the process of simplification.

Recognition Analysis

Table 4 presents the number of correct recognitions of the meaning of the Spanish present subjunctive and the corresponding percentages. There were 11 total items in this multiple choice task. Eight of the items contained subjunctive forms. The other three items were distractors which are not included in the count of correct forms or percentages. Participants had to choose between two English translations of a Spanish sentence containing the subjunctive.

Part	PreT	ImPT	DelPT	Total # correct in all 3 tests	PreT%	ImPT%	DelPT%
M1	3	2	6	11	37.5	25.0	75.0
M2	4	5	4	13	50.0	62.5	50.0
M3	4	4	5	13	50.0	50.0	62.5
M4	5	4	5	14	62.5	50.0	62.5
M5	5	4	5	14	62.5	50.0	62.5
F1	7	4	5	16	87.5	50.0	62.5
F2	4	4	4	12	50.0	50.0	50.0
F3	3	5	6	14	37.5	62.5	75.0
F4	4	5	4	13	50.0	62.5	50.0
F5	3	5	4	12	37.5	62.5	50.0

Table 4. Number of Correct Subjunctive Recognitions and Percentages.

F1 has the highest recognition score, 16, with the lowest score being 11 for M1. The most astonishing result is for F3. She scored 0 of a total of 39 on the production task, yet 14 out of a total of 24 on this task, which is a great improvement in comparison to the other participants. F3 reports that she has not received instruction in the present subjunctive (Table 1), yet she is able to recognize it at times. M1 has the lowest score of 11 but reports that he has received instruction on the form. Thus, self-reporting on instruction of this form does not seem to effect recognition skill.

The total number of correct recognitions of the present subjunctive by all the participants is 42 in both the pre-test and immediate post-test and 48 in the delayed posttest. These numbers, as expected, were not as widely dispersed as they were in the production task (56, 65, and 69 respectively). It should be noted that the items were also analyzed according to clause type. No patterns emerged to distinguish recognition in adverbial, adjectival or noun clauses.

Conclusions

For the first research question, it was hypothesized that immediately after receiving the treatment, the participants' written production of the present subjunctive would be higher than before receiving the input flood and that there would be no long-term recall of the form. This hypothesis is not supported by the

findings. In Table 3, other disturbing patterns are reported. One of these patterns, although occurring infrequently, was correct subjunctive production on the pretest yet incorrect production on one or both of the posttests. Five participants had one to four items of this pattern. One possible explanation for the occurrence of this pattern is that participants' attention was not focussed on the verbal paradigm under investigation but was focussed on passage content and, therefore, participants did not attend to grammatical information. On the other hand, participants may have overanalyzed or overmonitored the subjunctive forms and hypercorrected thus producing the incorrect form. Another possible explanation is that participants were studying the present subjunctive in their classrooms during the pretest and, thus, were more aware of the form at that time.

The patterns observed in this portion of the experiment lead the researcher to inconclusive results for the written production of the Spanish present subjunctive of the ten U.S. Spanish speakers in this study. This group exhibits sporadic written use of the form.

For the second research question, it was hypothesized that there would be little or no effect on the participants' recognition of the present subjunctive. No participant received a perfect score on this task. After receiving the treatment, six participants' scores either lowered or remained the same. Four improved on the immediate posttest but only one of these four demonstrated long-term retainment.

Implicit FonF did not seem to positively effect the production or recognition skills of the Spanish present subjunctive for these participants. Thus, simply using readings with an input flood of the form may not be a productive use of class time for these heritage speakers. More explicit grammar instruction with the FonF activity is warranted. Because none of the participants scored 100% on the recognition task of the subjunctive, semantic differences between the indicative and subjunctive may be experiencing a loss within this group in favor of lexicalization. In other words, with these participants there seems to be an erasing or leveling of a functional difference between the subjunctive and indicative moods.

Gutiérrez, Manuel J. 1994. Simplification, transfer, and convergence in Chicano Spanish. Bilingual Review 19.2.111-121.

Lee, James F. and Albert Valdman. 2000. Introduction. Form and meaning: Multiple perspectives, ed. by James F. Lee and Albert Valdman, ix-xx. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Leow, Ronald P. 2000. Attention, awareness, and focus on form research: A critical overview. Form and meaning: Multiple perspectives, ed. by James F. Lee and Albert Valdman, 69-96. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Ocampo, Francisco. 1990. El subjuntivo en tres generaciones de hablantes bilingües. Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues, ed. by John J. Bergen, 39-48. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Rojas Anadón, Silvia. 1979. El subjuntivo en el español de sudamérica: Indicios de cambio sintáctico. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Sanz, Cristina. 2000. What form to focus on? Linguistics, language awareness, and the education of L2 teachers. Form and meaning: Multiple perspectives, ed. by James F. Lee and Albert Valdman, 3-23. Boston: Heinle and Heinle

Schmidt, Richard 1990. The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics 11.127-158.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. The gradual loss of mood distinctions in Los Angeles Spanish. Language Variation and Change 6.3.255-272.

Tomlin, Russell S. and Victor Villa. 1994. Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 16.183-203.

Torreblanca, Máximo. 1997. El español hablado en el suroeste de los Estados Unidos y las normas lingüísticas españolas. La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría, ed. by M. Cecilia Colombi and Francisco X. Alarcón, 133-9. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

NOTES

[1] 201-202 are Spanish Level III and IV (second year Spanish)
241 is Introduction to the Study of Hispanic Literature
301-302 are Spanish Level V and VI (third year Spanish)
401 is Spanish Level VII (fourth year Spanish)

[2] Low Spanish reading ability = 1, high ability = 4

[3] Inc = incorrect, Cor = correct

REFERENCES

Anderson, John. 1995. Learning and memory: An integrated approach. New
    York: Wiley.

Colombi, M. Cecilia. 1997. Perfil del discurso escrito en textos de
    hispanohablantes: Teoría y práctica. La enseñanza del español a
    hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría, ed. by M. Cecilia Colombi and Francisco
    X. Alarcón, 175-89. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

DeKeyser, Robert. 1995. Learning second language grammar rules: An
    experiment with a miniature linguistic system. Studies in Second Language
    Acquisition 17.3.379-410.

Doughty, Catherine and Jessica Williams. 1998. Pedagogical choices in focus on
    form. Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition, ed. by
    Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 197-261. New York, NY:
    Cambridge University Press.

Williams, Jessica and Jacqueline Evans. 1998. What kind of focus and on which forms? Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition, ed. by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 139-55. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

Sample ProductionTask

Francisco: Mis padres están divorciados. Mi mamá es muy buena gente. Si ella (casarse) _____ otra vez, que (ser) _____ con alguien que le (tratar) _____ como reina. Esto es lo importante. De mi parte, prefiero un padrastro que no (trabajar) _____ todo el tiempo, que le (gustar) _____ pasar tiempo con su familia y que (comunicarse) _____ con nosotros para mantener un ambiente familiar abierto y amable.

Sample Recognition Task

_____ 1. Mi padre me llamará tan pronto como sepa el horario de su vuelo para la Navidad.

> a. My father already knows his Christmas flight schedule, and he will call me as soon as he can.
>
> b. My father doesn't know his Christmas flight schedule, but he will call me as soon as he does.

_____ 2. No hay nadie que sea más feliz que mi papá.

> a. There is no one in the world that is happier than my dad.
>
> b. There is no one here that is happier than my dad.