Regional variation of mood use in Spanish: A comparison among three Spanish-speaking regions

Silvia Beatriz Tort-Ranson

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Foreign Languages, Cultures, And Literatures

A. Gudmestad, Committee Chair
M. C. Caña Jiménez
P. T. Ridge

(September 12, 2024)
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: variationist sociolinguistics, conceptual replication, variable mood use, Spanish, regional variation

Regional variation of mood use in Spanish: A comparison among three Spanish-speaking regions

Silvia Beatriz Tort-Ranson

ABSTRACT

The current investigation is framed within variationist sociolinguistics, an area of study that examines how language varies and is influenced by linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Variationist research has reported that the use of verbal moods (the subjunctive and indicative) in Spanish is variable. One of the reasons for this variation appears to be a centuries-long process of language change, during which the subjunctive mood seemed to show a decline in favor of the indicative mood. Considering this gradual process of change, various investigations have examined how sociolinguistic factors condition variability in Spanish, focusing their analyses on different Spanish-speaking regions. To contribute to the understanding of mood variation in Spanish, this study explored a range of sociolinguistic factors across three Spanish-speaking regions (Rosario, Argentina; Barcelona, Spain; and Seville, Spain) by means of a conceptual replication of Gudmestad (2021), which studied variable mood use in Spanish across three regions (Quito, Ecuador; Mérida, Mexico; and Seville, Spain). The current study's participant pool (*N* = 107) consisted of Spanish speakers—men and women over 18 years old—residing in the three aforementioned metropolitan areas, who had lived in the same location for at least 15 years at the moment of the data collection. The data were collected via a written clause-elicitation task, with the purpose of having enough verbal-mood contexts to analyze, and a background questionnaire with basic demographic information. The results suggested that there was geographical variation of mood use, which reinforced the original study's findings on regional variation of mood use. Like Gudmestad (2021), the patterns of verbal moods with individual governors (e.g., *preferir que* 'to prefer that'), semantic category, and time reference

diverged across the regions. The examination of gender and individual participants also pointed to a possible connection between these factors and variable mood use across regions. These findings indicate that the envelopes of variation of mood use may be diverse across the regions under investigation, which suggests that different geographical regions may have slightly distinct grammars.

Regional variation of mood use in Spanish: A comparison among three Spanish-speaking regions

Silvia Beatriz Tort-Ranson

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

The current investigation is framed within variationist sociolinguistics, an area of study that examines how language varies, and which factors may condition this variation. Research within this field has found that Spanish speakers use subjunctive and indicative moods in a variable way. This variability in mood use may be connected to a long process of language change, over which speakers seem to be using the indicative mood in instances in which, in the past, they would have used the subjunctive mood. Taking this into account, various investigations have studied how the use of verbal moods in Spanish varies by analyzing different locations where Spanish is spoken. To contribute to this body of knowledge, the present investigation studied variable mood use in three regions (Rosario, Argentina; Barcelona, Spain; and Seville, Spain), by partially replicating an original investigation conducted by Gudmestad (2021) on variable mood use in Spanish across the regions of Quito, Ecuador; Mérida, Mexico; and Seville, Spain. Participants of the replication study (a total of 107) were three geographical groups of Spanish speakers. They were men and women over 18 years old who were residing in the three aforementioned urban areas and who had lived in the same location for at least 15 years. The participants completed a story with blanks that elicited the use of verbal moods and a questionnaire with basic demographic information. The findings indicated that Spanish speakers may use the subjunctive and indicative moods variably, according to different linguistic contexts and extralinguistic characteristics. Regarding geographical variation, the results showed that mood use was variable across the different locations analyzed, which reinforced the original study's findings on the presence of regional variation of mood use in Spanish.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my enormous gratitude to my Committee Chair professor, Dr. Aarnes Gudmestad, whose deep academic knowledge, teaching capacity, patience and support were invaluable during my research process. I am also thankful to all my professors in this master's degree program for their high teaching standards and for providing us students with knowledge and tools for our professional life. Moreover, I am especially grateful to one of my thesis committee professors, Dr. María del Carmen Caña Jiménez, who collaborated in this investigation by offering me contacts in Spain that would serve as potential participants in the research survey.

Furthermore, I am very thankful to Jenni Sanchez Selga, from Barcelona, Spain, for her willingness to be one of the members of the pilot sample and offering me a network of likely candidates to participate in the survey. Another special collaborator to whom I owe special thanks is Alex Caña Puig, from Barcelona, who selflessly acted as a source of many prospects for the investigation. Finally, I want to say a special thanks to my beloved husband, who morally supported me during the whole process and encouraged me to do a thesis in linguistics, as he could see how much I like this discipline.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

Sociolinguistic research focused on mood use in Spanish has reported the presence of variation in the use of verbal moods (subjunctive and indicative) in different linguistic contexts. This variation appears to be the result of, at least in part, a prolonged and progressive process of language change, in which the indicative forms have increased whereas subjunctive forms seem to have decreased (Poplack, Torres Cacoullos, Dion, de Andrade Berlinck, Digesto, Lacasse & Steuck, 2018; Silva-Corvalán, 1984, 1985, 2001; Torres Cacoullos, LaCasse, Johns, & De la Rosa Yacomelo , 2017). In order to better understand this slow process of change and the accompanying variation, sociolinguistic research has investigated the impact of a range of sociolinguistic factors on the use of verbal moods.

With respect to extralinguistic factors, I investigate the variables of geographical region, gender, and individual participants. Regarding geographical region—the central focus of the current study—, this is a factor that a relatively recent body of research has specifically explored by conducting cross-dialectal analyses (Dunlap, 2006; García, 2011; Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a, 2014b; Schwenter & Hoff, 2020; Gudmestad, 2021). This kind of analysis, between or among the geographical regions where Spanish speakers reside, fosters the exploration of the possible relationship between variable mood use and the regions under investigation. The outcome of the aforementioned studies revealed that there appeared to be regional variation in mood use. This means that when comparing the use of verbal moods by certain participant groups living in various regions, each region appeared to exhibit certain patterns of use that differed from other regions. Namely, different rates of use of the subjunctive or indicative appeared to be related in a different way to a set of linguistic factors (see Background chapter). Mood variation, therefore, is a worthy issue to investigate cross-dialectally in order to further explore the extent to which verbal moods are variable across geographical regions. With reference to gender, prior research (Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a; Waltermire, 2017; Gudmestad, 2021) has shown various results, so it remains unclear whether this social variable has a generalized effect across regions or whether the role it plays in mood variation is geographically restricted. Lastly, the analysis of individual participants, not widely examined as a variable in prior research, has reported to be a source of variation in mood use (Gudmestad, 2012). The current study then serves to explore whether there appears to be evidence of individual variation in mood use across regions.

In addition, with the purpose of learning more about regional variation, I investigate a set of linguistic factors, namely, preverbal lexical items (i.e., governors), semantic category and time reference that have shown to be important in previous research on mood variation in Spanish (Blake, 1983; Deshors & Waltermire, 2019; Dunlap 2006; García, 2011, Gudmestad 2010, 2012, 2021; Schwenter & Hoff, 2020, Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Studerus, 1995; Yelin & Czerwionka, 2017). I explore how speakers from different regions use verbal moods in the contexts defined by these variables. In other words, I investigate whether participants from three regions use verbal moods differently with a range of governors, semantic categories, and time references. While previous studies have found variability in mood use in relation to these linguistic factors, each investigation has been conducted using different methodologies and including different factors to account for variation, which has made the comparisons of mood use across cross-dialectal studies challenging. This state of research, at the same time, is inspiring for new studies on mood use intending to achieve comparability of methods, which will enhance the comparability of outcomes in relation to different geographical regions. This is the case of the current study, which is motivated by the aim of carrying out an exploratory analysis focused on different regions and comparing methods and findings with one previous investigation in particular (Gudmestad, 2021).

The goal of the present study, hence, is to conduct a conceptual replication (Porte & McManus, 2019, chapter 5) of one of the recent cross-dialectal studies—Gudmestad (2021)—in an attempt to further understanding on variable mood use in Spanish, through a systematic comparison between both investigations. It should be noted that the use of replication as a tool for comparison involves more than confirming prior findings. Indeed, this tool allows for increasing knowledge that can be used for future research (Porte & McManus, 2019). This could be a valuable resource for those studies focused on a cross-regional approach of mood use in Spanish; particularly for those intending to provide a comparison of regions analyzed by a set of prior research. Thus, the aim of the current investigation is to explore variation in the use of verbal moods in three Spanish-speaking regions (two different and one similar from the original investigation) and connect this possible variation with linguistic and extralinguistic factors that are comparable to the original study.

Review of Literature

Variationist Sociolinguistics

Variationism is an area of study within sociolinguistics that analyzes the linguistic and social factors that influence language variation and change. This area of research is based on the fundamental assumptions that variation is both systematic and inherent in language and that language is a system in constant evolution (Tagliamonte, 2012). A central construct in variationist sociolinguistics is the linguistic variable, defined as "differences in a linguistic form without (apparent) changes in meaning" (Walker, 2010, p. 8) or as "different ways of saying the same thing" (Tagliamonte, 2012, p. 4).

To understand the concept of the linguistic variable, it is crucial to distinguish four components in this domain: the linguistic variable, variants, variable context, and constraints. Firstly, the linguistic variable represents the phenomenon that displays language variation. For example, in the case of the current study, mood distinction, which refers to verbal moods in Spanish, is the linguistic variable under investigation. Secondly, the variants are the different linguistic forms in alternation that correspond to the linguistic variable. Example (1), which is an item from a survey used to collect data on mood distinction in Spanish (Studerus, 1995, p. 102), illustrates the variants of mood distinction: the subjunctive and indicative.

(1) *Qué bueno que mis primos están*$_{\text{INDIC}}$*/estén*$_{\text{SUBJC}}$ *aquí*. 'How good that my cousins are here.'

Third, the variable context refers to the circumstances in which variation takes place and excludes categorical use. In the case of mood distinction, the variable context consists of contexts in which the occurrence of either the subjunctive or indicative is possible. Example (2), an item from the same survey (Studerus, 1995, p. 102) exemplifies a variable context, given by the phrase *Era triste que* ‘It was sad that’, which prompts alternation of verbal moods. By comparing two groups of native speakers of related varieties of Spanish on the Mexico-United States border, living either in Laredo, Texas or in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, it was shown that participants of each group chose the utterance in the subjunctive 61 percent and 71 percent of the time, while the indicative was chosen 39 percent and 29 percent of the time, respectively, indicating variability of mood use (Studerus, 1995, p. 105).

(2) *Era triste que ellos estaban*$_{\text{INDIC}}$*/estuvieran*$_{\text{SUBJC}}$ *enfermos* ‘It was sad that they were sick.’

Example (3) illustrates a categorical context of subjunctive use. In interview data collected from a group of speakers living in Los Angeles, California, all participants used the subjunctive with *ser imposible* ‘to be impossible’ (Silva-Corvalán, 1994, p. 261).

(3) *Es imposible que pares*$_{\text{SUBJC}}$ ‘It is impossible that (you/she/he/it) stop.’

Lastly, constraints are the factors, internal (linguistic) or external (social/extralinguistic) that condition the occurrence of the variants. An example of a linguistic constraint on mood distinction is lexical items (henceforth called governors). For instance, the phrases *Qué bueno que* “How good that’ and *Era triste que* ‘It was sad that’, in examples (1) and (2) above, are governors that can influence the use of a certain mood in those utterances (e.g., Bove & Limerick, 2021; Gudmestad, 2010, 2012, 2021; Poplack et al., 2018; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Studerus, 1995). Furthermore, examples of extralinguistic constraints that have been analyzed in relation to mood use in Spanish include age, gender, education, and geographical region (Gallego & Alonso-Marks 2014a, 2014b; Gudmestad, 2010, 2012, 2021; Waltermire, 2014, 2017). In general terms, variationist analyses seek to identify the various linguistic and extralinguistic factors that concomitantly constrain the occurrence of the linguistic forms in variation. The patterns that emerge as a result of these analyses are used to interpret and explain complex patterns of language variation and change (Tagliamonte, 2006, 2012; Walker, 2010).

Linguistic variables can take place at the level of phonetics/phonology, morphology, syntax, the lexicon, or discourse. The first variationist studies were focused on phonetic variables in English, conducted by Labov on the island of Martha's Vineyard and in New York City (Labov, 1972). For example, the phonological variable studied on Martha's Vineyard was the distinction in pronouncing the first elements of the diphthongs /ai/ in words like "spider" and "sliding" and /au/ in words like "dowdy" and "crouch" (Labov, 1972, p. 12). Use of the linguistic variable varied across several regions of the island, ethnic groups, age, and occupation of participants. Another example is the phonological variable studied in New York City, the presence or absence of consonantal [r] in postvocalic position, as in "car" and "card", in relation to social and stylistic stratification in the speech of salespeople of department stores connected to different social classes (Labov, 1972).

Returning to the definition of the linguistic variable, it may be said that there was no doubt, from the beginning, that it was possible to study phonological variables from a variationist perspective, given that their variants convey the same meaning. That is, the concept of semantic equivalence did not present difficulties with phonetic variables because different pronunciations of a word do not change its meaning. However, this definition, which primarily involved the idea of semantic equivalence, created controversy as sociolinguistic research evolved over the years. As the variants of a morphosyntactic variable may have different meanings, the notion of semantic equivalence posed difficulties. Consequently, the definition of morphosyntactic variation has undergone a series of revisions as researchers debated the appropriateness of studying this type of variation (Tagliamonte, 2012, pp. 15-16).

The debate on the morphosyntactic variable revolved around whether this kind of variable was really "different ways of saying the same thing" (Tagliamonte, 2012, p. 4). There have been arguments in favor and arguments against the definition of a linguistic variable based on the same meaning, and therefore, the possibility of studying a morphosyntactic variable from a variationist perspective. Those in favor (Labov, 1972; G. Sankoff, 1988) stated that the methods of probabilistic analyses could be directly extended from phonology to syntax. Those who were against the idea of the morphosyntactic variable as having the same meaning between variants proposed that, unlike phonological variables, morphosyntactic variables involved different referential discourse meanings and different non-referential discourse meanings (Lavandera, 1978). To illustrate these two concepts, referential and non-referential discourse meaning, we consider the examples (4) and (5) below:

> *Y de este modo es la ignorancia causa del pecado; por ejemplo, cuando uno sabe que es un hombre aquel a quien mata, pero no sabe que es su padre; (4) o <u>cuando uno sabe que un acto es</u>*<u>$_{\text{INDIC}}$</u> *<u>deleitable</u>, (5) <u>mas no sabe que sea</u>*<u>$_{\text{SUBJC}}$</u> *<u>pecado</u>.* 'And in this way, ignorance is the cause of sin; for example, when one knows that it is a man he is killing, but does not know that it his father; or when one knows that an act is pleasurable, but does not know that it is a sin (Schwenter & Hoff, 2020, p. 13, my underlining).

According to Schwenter and Hoff (2020), in the underlined clauses, the governor (verb + particle) *saber que* 'to know that' prompted the use of the verbal mood *ser* 'to be' in different moods, indicative and subjunctive. We can say that these clauses have the same referential discourse meaning because they are referring to the same subject matter—cause of sin. However, they have different non-referential discourse meanings due to the attitudinal constraints that favored the use of the variants, indicative and subjunctive mood.

As indicated by Lavandera (1978), therefore, it was not the meaning that had to be similar between variants; what had to be similar was the function. In this way, the author asserted that morphosyntactic variables needed to be assigned a different status and another kind of interpretation. Between these two perspectives, there has been a continuum of arguments that found ways of sorting through the problem of the same meaning or function among variants (D. Sankoff, 1988; Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Tagliamonte, 2012). These arguments are today included in what is called *function-based* approach, which has been successfully used to study linguistic variables in recent research. While a *form-based* approach is that in which a variable context is defined by considering two or more forms, approximately equivalent in meaning, which alternate with each other, a *function-based* approach defines the linguistic variable focusing on common discourse functions of the variants, reframing the notion of which elements of the linguistic variable need to be equivalent (Walker, 2010).

Mood Distinction in Spanish

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on morphosyntactic variables over the years, among which mood choice in Spanish has been one of its objects of study. Mood is one of the manifestations of modality that reveals speakers' attitude towards information. Today, even prescriptive grammar (*Asociación de la Lengua Española,* 2010) acknowledges that the concept of 'perspective', while being useful to define mood, is vague. The semantic oppositions of certainty/uncertainty, reality/unreality, assertion/non-assertion are also considered useful tools to circumscribe the use of mood in Spanish, although they are still too broad to explain every syntactic context (*Asociación de la Lengua Española*, 2010, p. 473). Mood distinction may be present in subordinate clauses, as in examples (1) and (2) and are the syntactic context studied most often, but the distinction can also occur in main clauses, as shown in (6) (Schwenter, 2011, p. 126).

(6) *Tal vez el semestre termine*$_{SUBJC/}$ *termina*$_{INDIC}$ *hoy.* 'Perhaps the semester ends today.'

When it comes to observing how Spanish speakers use verbal moods, sociolinguistic research has shown variation between the subjunctive and indicative in various linguistic contexts and this variation is considered to be the result of a long and gradual process of language change (Silva-Corvalán, 1994, 2001). Thus, variation of mood use, and language change over time, have been reported by empirical research that studied mood in Spanish (Deshors & Waltermire, 2019; Dunlap, 2006; García, 2011; Gallego & Alonso-Marks 2014a, 2014b; Gudmestad, 2010, 2012, 2021; Poplack et al., 2018; Silva-Corvalán, 1985; 1994; Studerus, 1995; Schwenter & Hoff, 2020; Torres Cacoullos et al., 2017; Yelin & Czerwionka, 2017; Waltermire, 2017).

Regarding language change, the subjunctive mood has been undergoing a process of reduction, due to the loss of certain forms and the extension of the indicative mood to contexts that used to show an exclusive use of subjunctive (Poplack et al., 2018; Silva-Corvalán, 1985, 2001; Torres Cacoullos et al., 2017). This gradual and prolonged process that the Spanish language has undergone appears to be one of the causes of the variable use of indicative and subjunctive (Silva Corvalán, 1985).

Focusing specifically on language variation, rather than language change, prior sociolinguistic research on mood distinction in Spanish as a morphosyntactic variable phenomenon has identified a range of linguistic factors that influence mood use. Among all the variables studied, three that have been investigated in multiple studies include individual governors (pre-verbal lexical items), semantic category, and time reference. I analyze these linguistic factors in the current investigation and thus give attention to them here. Other linguistic factors that have been examined include negative polarity (Schwenter & Hoff, 2020; Torres Cacoullos et al., 2017), presence of the complementizer *que* ‘that’ (Torres Cacoullos et al., 2017; Waltermire, 2017), switch/same reference between matrix and subordinate clause subjects (Schwenter & Hoff, 2020), and distance or intervening material between matrix and subordinate verbs (Waltermire, 2017).

Lexical items placed before a mood-distinction context (e.g., adverbials and subordinate clauses), termed governors by some researchers, have been extensively examined (Blake, 1983; Deshors & Waltermire, 2019; Dunlap, 2006; Gudmestad 2010, 2012, 2021; Schwenter & Hoff, 2020; Yelin & Czerwionka, 2017). In one study, Blake (1983) investigated the relationship between individual governors (e.g., *ser obvio* ‘to be obvious’, *ser seguro* ‘to be sure’, *darse cuenta* ‘to realize’, *tener miedo* ‘to be afraid’) and mood distinction. The findings showed that mood use was variable, and that this variation appeared to depend on the governor. Considering participant’s responses on a completion task, mood use depended more on each individual governor than on any other categories in his investigation. For example, *alegrarse* ‘to be glad about’ alternated between the subjunctive and indicative moods, in contrast with prescriptive grammar rules that would have required the use of subjunctive for this governor (Blake, 1983, pp. 27-29). In another study, Gudmestad (2012) found variable mood use with most governors (e.g., *ser bueno que* ‘to be good that’, *no pensar que* ‘to not think that’), meaning that 17.10 percent of the governors (6/35) prompted categorical mood use, while all the remaining governors (82.90% or 29/35) showed variable mood use (see also, Gudmestad, 2021, for an analysis of categorical and variable governors).

The next linguistic factor I turn to is semantic category, which refers to the general meaning of governors. For example, *ser obvio que* 'to be obvious that', *darse cuenta de que* 'to realize that', *estar claro que* 'to be clear that' are three governors that convey the general meaning of assertion. Different semantic categories have been shown to be connected to different rates of subjunctive and indicative use. For example, prior research has shown that semantic categories of volition, cause, purpose, and concession appeared as the most favorable contexts for subjunctive use, while assertion appeared as the most favorable context for indicative use (Silva Corvalán, 1994). Studerus' (1995) findings, however, showed variability in mood use with all semantic categories (i.e., comment, uncertainty, assertion, and reporting) that he investigated. In Gudmestad (2010, 2012), semantic category was an important factor. In particular, a hierarchy of subjunctive use was observed with the rate of subjunctive use decreasing in the following order: volition, comment, uncertainty, temporality, and assertion.

Time reference has shown to be another important factor related to variable mood choice (García, 2011; Gudmestad 2010, 2012, 2021; Studerus, 1995; Yelin & Czerwionka, 2017). This variable is defined in accordance with the temporal context in which each utterance is situated—that is, future, present, or past. In some studies, results have shown that future-time reference favored the use of the subjunctive, while past-time reference favored use of indicative (Gudmestad, 2010; Studerus, 1995; Yelin & Czerwionka, 2017). In Gudmestad (2012), for the overall dataset, the analysis of time reference showed the aforementioned trend regarding future- and past-time reference. In García (2011), time reference was analyzed only with the governors *quizá* 'perhaps' and *quizás* 'perhaps' in several countries and was found to predict mood use for both adverbs. However, statistical analysis revealed a difference between the two adverbs in relation to time reference. Whereas the subjunctive was disfavored in past-time contexts and favored in present-time contexts for both adverbs, future-time reference disfavored the subjunctive with *quizá* and favored the subjunctive with *quizás*. Mood variation, therefore, was affected in a different way by time reference according to each individual governor (*quizá* and *quizás)* (García, 2011).

Three extralinguistic or social factors that have been analyzed in prior research and are examined in the current study are gender, individual participants, and geographical region of residence (Dunlap, 2006; García, 2011; Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a; 2014b; Gudmestad, 2021; Schwenter & Hoff, 2020; Waltermire, 2014). Examples of other extralinguistic factors that have been studied in prior research but that are not analyzed in the current study are age/generation (Gallego and Alonso-Marks, 2014a, 2014b; Waltermire, 2017), education (Waltermire, 2017), race, occupation, and socioeconomic class (Labov, 1972).

With respect to gender, this variable has yielded mixed results in different investigations. For instance, Gallego and Alonso-Marks (2014a) examined utterances produced by speakers from Rosario, Argentina and Toledo, Spain in an acceptability judgement task. They found that for those sentences that were in the indicative when the subjunctive would have been expected according to prescriptive rules, women accepted them to a lesser degree than men (Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a, p. 376). Sentences (5) and (6), with governors of volition (*sugerir* 'to suggest', *preferir* 'to prefer') illustrate these findings. Men (specifically, the group of older men in Toledo) showed higher acceptability rates of utterances in which the use of the indicative would be deemed to not follow normative rules, as in example (7), while women in both regions rejected this sentence. In example (8), whereas subjunctive use was widely accepted by the whole dataset, it was preferred more by women than by men (Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a, p. 366).

(7) *Ale te sugiere que visitas*$_{\text{INDIC}}$ *a tu amigo* ‘Ale suggests that you visit your friend’. (Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a, p. 376)

(8) *Pablo prefiere que el novio llegue*$_{\text{SUBJC}}$ *temprano* ‘Paul prefers that the groom arrives early’. (Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a, p. 366)

In another study that examined gender and education level together, Waltermire (2017) found that highly educated men appeared to use the subjunctive more than less educated women. Finally, adding to the diversity of findings on gender, Gudmestad (2021) did not find gender to be an important factor influencing mood distinction.

The second extralinguistic independent variable, individual participants, has not been extensively studied in research. However, Gudmestad (2012) analyzed it and found evidence of inter-speaker variability in mood use. Considering only the governors that participants used on average at least three times (11 of 35 governors), Gudmestad made a comparison between the range of subjunctive use with governors across participants with the average rate of subjunctive use for the whole participant group. Evidence of individual variation was observed. She found that the individual participants produced different rates of subjunctive with each of the 11 governors. For example, for the governor *esperar que* ‘to hope that’, the range of subjunctive was 75-100 percent, and the average rate of subjunctive use was 95.9 percent. Considering the individual participants’ use with *esperar que* ‘to hope that’, 11 of them produced the subjunctive categorically, nine of them produced non-subjunctive forms categorically and no participant exhibited variable use. In another example, for the governor *tal vez* ‘perhaps’ the range of subjunctive use was 0-71.4 percent, and the average frequency of subjunctive use was 30.8 percent. With this governor, no participant exhibited categorical subjunctive, 10 of them exhibited variable use and 10 participants showed categorical use of non-subjunctive forms

(Gudmestad, 2012, p.19). Further, it was revealed that for two governors (*gustar que* ‘to be pleased that’ and *mientras* ‘while’) the range of subjunctive use was 0-100 percent, which means that some participants used the subjunctive categorically (12 participants for *gustar que* and 5 participants for *mientras*), some used non-subjunctive forms categorically (six participants for *gustar que* and six participants for *mientras*), and others exhibited variable use (two participants for *gustar que* and nine participants for *mientras*). With the other nine governors, as illustrated above with *esperar que* ‘to hope that’ and *tal vez* ‘perhaps’, some participants exhibited variable use, while others produced one mood categorically. This indicates that mood use was more variable among individual participants with certain governors (in this study, *gustar que* and *mientras*) than with others. Finally, for each of the 11 governors, many participants used both verbal moods, meaning that one of these governors exhibited categorical mood use for all speakers. Therefore, examining possible differences in mood use among individual participants appears to be worthy of investigation, as this factor may help to better understand variable mood use in Spanish (Gudmestad, 2012, p. 20).

Regarding geographical region, some investigations on mood in Spanish were conducted in one region where Spanish was the dominant language (e.g., Blake, 1983, in Mexico City; Silva-Corvalán, 1985, on the Covarrubias variety in Spain; and Yelin & Czerwionka, 2017, in Argentina), whereas others adopted a pan-Spanish perspective (e.g., Deshors & Waltermire, 2019; Torres Cacoullos et al., 2017; Waltermire, 2017). Other investigations compared different Spanish-speaking populations in the same study, carrying out cross-dialectal analyses. Among these, Dunlap (2006) examined Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela. García (2011) studied Argentina, Cuba, Mexico, Perú and Venezuela. Gallego and Alonso-Marks (2014a) and (2014b) compared Rosario, Argentina and Toledo, Spain. Schwenter and Hoff (2020) analyzed Argentina, Mexico, and Spain. Lastly, Gudmestad (2021) compared three urban areas: Quito, Ecuador; Mérida, Mexico; and Seville, Spain.

With reference to findings about regional variation, Dunlap (2006) showed that, with specific adverbials clauses introduced by *luego de que* 'after' and *después de que* 'after', the use of the subjunctive was favored in Spain, when compared with Mexico, where the use of the indicative was preferred. In García (2011), it was found that geographical region was an important factor in relation to mood distinction for *quizás* 'perhaps'; the subjunctive mood was favored in Argentina and Cuba and disfavored in Peru and Venezuela. Regional variation was not observed with *quizá* 'perhaps'. Gallego and Alonso-Marks (2014a) investigated noun complement clauses like examples (7) and (8) described above. In this investigation, slight differences were found between the two regions studied (Rosario and Toledo). Among the differences, for example, was the construction *¿Quieres que vamos*$_{\text{INDIC}}$ */ vayamos*$_{\text{SUBJC}}$ *al cine?* 'Would you like to go to the movies?', which showed high acceptability of the subjunctive by most participants in Toledo, while a considerable percentage of participants in Rosario accepted both moods (Gallego and Alonso-Marks, 2014a, p. 374). In another study, Schwenter and Hoff (2020) found Argentina and Mexico overall more alike to one another and more different from Spain. Spain exhibited the highest subjunctive rate compared with the other two. However, when analyzing each linguistic independent variable across dialects, a great number of similarities appeared across the three geographical regions. For example, with individual governors, a set of these (e.g., *exigir* 'to demand', *mandar* 'to command') favored the subjunctive, whereas another set (e.g., *esperar* 'to hope', *querer* 'to want') showed the lowest rates of subjunctive use. Finally, in Gudmestad (2021), a study that will be described with more detail in the next section, clear differences across geographical regions were observed with respect to mood use in relation to individual governors, semantic category, and time reference.

As investigations have shown the presence of mood variation across geographical regions, there is need for more research that examines different Spanish-speaking regions to better understand how and to what extent mood use is variable across regions. The perspective of the present study, then, is cross-dialectal. It seeks to explore similarities and differences in variable mood use across different Spanish-speaking regions. Building on prior research, the present work replicates Gudmestad (2021), with the goal of contributing to growing knowledge on mood use in Spanish and expanding the generalizability of findings in the light of a new dataset.

Replication Research

As mentioned earlier, the present study is a conceptual replication of Gudmestad's (2021) cross-dialectal study of variable mood in Spanish. The need for replication arises from the fact that a considerable number of empirical investigations are carried out on certain areas of study (e.g., mood variation) but they differ in their methods, analyses, geographical contexts, participants characteristics, etc. As a result, the accumulated knowledge is quite diverse, yielding a lack of a sense of continuity or systematicity (Porte & McManus, 2019). Specifically, Gudmestad (2021) mentions the challenges of making comparisons across regions that have been studied, given the methodological differences existing across investigations, which creates the need for more research that compares different regions in a single research design (Gudmestad, 2021, pp. 376, 387).

It is important, first, to define what a conceptual replication is. According to Porte and McManus (2019, chapter 5), this kind of replication focuses on comparative outcomes between investigations, where a certain distance is maintained between the replication and the original/target study. The focus of a conceptual replication is on the findings from the target study, but not with the purpose of direct comparison with the replication findings. Rather, the aim is to broaden the application and the generalizability of the underlying theory of the target investigation, by using a new dataset and a method that relate to the original study. Thus, the use of replication goes beyond the confirmation of the original findings, where the outcome is cumulative knowledge that can be used for further examination (Porte & McManus, 2019). In line with this definition, Mackey (2012) acknowledges that replication, as a general concept, is a precept of scientific advancement for its usefulness to validate research and accept new theories. Specifically, conceptual replications are those through which researchers re-examine similar research questions by using different populations, different ways of manipulating variables, or different study designs (Mackey, 2012).

The Target Study

The target study for the current replication is a cross-dialectal investigation carried out by Gudmestad (2021). Its purpose was to find similarities and differences in the use of verbal mood in three different Spanish-speaking locations. Further objectives were to find categorical and variable mood use with governors across the three geographical regions and to analyze the relationship of linguistic and social factors on mood use across the regions. Regarding its method, this study was focused on three native Spanish-speaking groups (*N* = 86), residing in different urban areas: Quito, Ecuador (*n* = 28), Mérida, Mexico (*n* = 32), and Seville, Spain (*n* = 26). Data were collected using a written contextualized-clause-elicitation-task. This task constituted a conversational story with 30 segments, each of which had an initial phrase (where the individual governors under investigation were included) and a blank that participants were asked to complete, following the thread of the conversation. This task type differentiated from other data-elicitation methods based on decontextualized sentences (e.g., a cloze forced-selection survey, Studerus, 1995; acceptability judgement task along with cloze-forced-selection tests, Gallego & Alonso-Marks, 2014a) in that it provided situational contexts for the utterances. As the subjunctive occurs infrequently in natural speech, the goal was to ensure that there would be enough data to analyze multiple independent variables. With respect to the variables of analysis, the dependent variable was the verbal mood used in a mood-distinction context (subjunctive or indicative). The linguistic independent variables were individual governors (pre-verbal lexical items that elicited mood distinction), semantic category (volition, comment, uncertainty, temporality, and assertion), and time reference (which corresponded to the past-, present- or future-time of each segment of the story). There was a fourth linguistic variable analyzed, hypotheticality, which identified non-hypothetical, past hypothetical, and non-past hypothetical utterances in the story. Three extralinguistic factors were gender, geographical region, and participant (as a random effect in the mixed-effect models).

The data analysis of the target study included four steps. First, cross-tabulations were conducted to show the frequency of use of verbal mood for each region. Second, a set of cross-tabulations was carried out to identify the frequency of verbal moods for each individual governor, which allowed for the identification of variable and categorical mood use with individual governors for each geographical region. Third, after removing categorical governors, another set of cross-tabulations was performed to show the frequency of use of verbal moods among variable governors for each participant group. Fourth, mixed-effects models were fit, which included tests of statistical significance, relative strength, and constraint hierarchies.

The findings for individual governors, in terms of the frequency of subjunctive and indicative use across regions for all the governors (exhibiting categorical as well as variable mood use), revealed that the group from Spain used the subjunctive most often (68.10%) and that the Ecuadorian and Mexican groups used the subjunctive at a similar rate (63.30 % and 64.70 % respectively). From a set of 30 governors, Spain used the subjunctive categorically with 11 governors, followed by Ecuador (seven) and, lastly, by Mexico (four). There was no individual governor that exhibited categorical use by all the three groups. However, for eight of the governors, two of the regions showed categorical subjunctive use. Overall, 18 of the 30 governors analyzed exhibited categorical mood use for at least one region, and 12 of the governors exhibited variable mood use in all three regional groups. For each region, most of the governors were variable: for Ecuador, 23/30 governors; for Mexico, 24/30 governors, and for Spain, 16/30 governors. For all the governors (variable and categorical), the difference between the groups that used subjunctive the most and the least was 4.80 percent. Once the governors that exhibited categorical mood use were removed from the dataset, the results showed that the Mexican group used the subjunctive most often (64.20%), followed by Spain (58.00%) and lastly by Ecuador (52.10%). The difference between the highest and lowest frequency of subjunctive use revealed a range of use of 12.10 percent.

Regarding the findings of the rest of the linguistic factors, semantic category was the variable that appeared to have a stronger influence on mood use than time reference and hypotheticality for all regions. Time reference was a conditioning factor in Ecuador and Mexico but not in Spain. The results were different for the two regions: subjunctive use was higher in present-time compared to future-time contexts for Ecuador, whereas for Mexico, subjunctive use was higher for the future-time than present-time contexts. For the variable hypotheticality, results showed regional differences. The Spanish and Ecuadorian participants showed different patterns of subjunctive use with hypotheticality. However, the Mexican participants exhibited certain similarities in subjunctive use with each of the other two regions. In particular, Mexico and Ecuador tended to favor the use of the subjunctive in past hypothetical contexts in relation to non-hypothetical ones. Moreover, Mexico and Spain exhibited a lower subjunctive use in non-past hypothetical contexts in relation to non-hypothetical ones.

With reference to the findings on the extralinguistic factors, the variable of gender was not a significant predictor of mood use. Regarding geographical regions, mood use appeared to vary across regions, though similarities among the regions were also observed. Overall, the three geographical regions were similar in that semantic category and hypotheticality influenced mood use. However, there were similarities and differences across regions associated with specific effects of semantic category and hypotheticality. For example, the only similarity for all three regions was that subjunctive use was higher in semantic contexts of volition compared to contexts of temporality. Other effects of semantic category (assertion, uncertainty, comment) on mood were different for the three regions. Moreover, subjunctive use with hypotheticality indicated different patterns between Spanish and Ecuadorian regions, whereas the Mexican region shared similarities with the other two. Additionally, Mexico and Ecuador favored the use of subjunctive in past-hypothetical contexts in relation to non-hypothetical ones, while Mexico and Spain disfavored the use of subjunctive in non-past hypothetical contexts compared to non-hypothetical ones. All in all, according to Gudmestad (2021), the differences found in mood use with governors and other factors for each region may be a sign of existence of different grammars or different stages of language change. Specifically, considering the governors that exhibited variation across regions, there was evidence that the envelope of variation for mood distinction may differ regionally. The overarching contribution of this study was to contribute knowledge about possible geographical variation of mood distinction.

The Replication Study

The present study carried out a conceptual replication of Gudmestad (2021) by replicating several elements of the target investigation and modifying others. With the variationist sociolinguistic approach as a starting point, I primarily replicated the overarching area of exploration, which had the aim of finding possible geographical variation in mood use (subjunctive or indicative) in three different Spanish-speaking regions. I replicated Gudmestad's first two questions in the target investigation and modified the third one (due to differences in analytical procedures). First, how do the governors that exhibit categorical and variable mood use compare among Rosario, Barcelona, and Seville? Second, how does the frequency of use of verbal moods compare among the places of residence under investigation? Third, how are the sociolinguistic factors related across the regions of residence under investigation?

Regarding the method, I replicated two characteristics of the participants of the target investigation, that is, (i) native Spanish speakers (ii) living in a region where Spanish is spoken. With respect to the geographical regions, I also replicated the decision to focus on three Spanish-speaking regions, with similarities and differences: a similar region (Seville, Spain) and two different ones (Rosario, Argentina, and Barcelona, Spain). With reference to the Barcelona, I acknowledge the presence of Catalan as a co-official language in the region along with Spanish. It is important to clarify that the participants in this investigation were all Spanish dominant speakers. Concerning the data-collection instrument, I replicated the task type of the target investigation, a contextualized-clause-elicitation-task, as I considered its design as an advantage in comparison with other tasks because it allows for a large enough number of mood-choice contexts to be analyzed and because it constitutes contextualized language. Prior research has revealed the disadvantages and challenges entailed in trying to collect a wide number of tokens of mood-choice contexts in Spanish from natural speech data (Waltermire 2014, 2017). In this sense, this task type enabled me to obtain enough data to analyze multiple independent variables, as stated in Gudmestad (2021). Moreover, while being a controlled data-collection instrument, it was advantageous in comparison with tasks with more restricted opportunities for creative expression (e.g., cloze forced-selection and acceptability judgements), as participants could get involved in the content of a story. I also replicated the number of tasks the participants completed: the mood-distinction task and a background questionnaire that gathered basic socio-demographic data. There was a difference in my procedure, though, as it was administered online, while the target study collected the data in person using paper and pen/pencil (see Method-Data collection for the description of the online procedure and details on the three documents).

Furthermore, I replicated some of the coding procedures of the target study, including the dependent variable, verbal mood (subjunctive or indicative), and some of the independent variables. While other independent linguistic variables have been analyzed in prior research (e.g., negative polarity in Torres Cacoullos et. al., 2017, and Schwenter & Hoff, 2020; presence of the complementizer *que* 'that', in Torres Cacoullos et al., 2017 and Waltermire, 2017; switch/same reference between matrix and subordinate clause subjects, in Schwenter & Hoff, 2020; and distance or intervening material between matrix and subordinate verbs, in Waltermire, 2017), my choice of the independent variables was primarily based on the target study's considerations, being this a replication. Therefore, the independent linguistic variables I replicated were some of the individual governors (with the same total of 30 governors, 19 were replicated and 11 were new to my study), semantic category, and time reference. I opted not to include hypothetically along with time reference as they were coded in the target study because time reference and hypotheticality variables were partially confounded, insofar as no distinction in time reference was made when the utterance was past-hypothetical, and the distinction was only partially made when the utterance was non-past hypothetical. I chose to investigate time reference, rather than hypotheticality, in the current study because it is the variable that has been more widely investigated (A. Gudmestad, personal communication. November 2, 2023).

With respect to the extralinguistic variables, I replicated the variable of gender. I included an additional one, individual participants, which was only analyzed as a random effect in the target investigation. I chose to analyze it based on the considerations in Gudmestad (2012), who indicated the value of examining the extent to which individuals may vary their use of verbal moods (Gudmestad, 2012, p. 19). My intention was, thus, to observe the degree to which individual variation was present across the three regions. Finally, as previously mentioned, I also included the variable geographical region in the current study. I replicated one region (Seville) and selected two different regions, Rosario, and Barcelona.

Regarding the data analysis, I replicated the first, second, and third steps of the target study, based on cross-tabulations, and I carried out a fourth step that was not a replication of the target investigation. By analyzing each regional group separately, I first conducted cross-tabulations and showed the overall frequencies of verbal moods for each region. Second, I identified, through cross-tabulations, the frequency of verbal moods in relation to the individual governors in order to identify those which exhibited categorical and variable mood in each region. Third, after removing governors that exhibited categorical use in each region, I analyzed the frequency of verbal moods for variable governors across the regions. Fourth, I conducted cross-tabulations to analyze the frequency of verbal moods according to each independent variable, linguistic and extralinguistic, for each region (see Method-Data analysis for details). In sum, the aim of this study was to contribute to knowledge on variable mood use in Spanish, by investigating three different Spanish-speaking regions and by conducting a conceptual replication, which is scarce in variationist sociolinguistics.

Method

Participants

The sample population that participated in the investigation was made up of three groups of native Spanish speakers residing in different Spanish-speaking urban regions, who had lived in the same area for at least 15 years when the data collection took place (*N* = 107). The group from Rosario was born in Argentina and was residing in the urban area of Rosario (*n* = 44). Their average age was 45.75 years (*SD* = 17.97, *range* = 18-78). Twenty-six were women and eighteen were men. Regarding their educational level, there were participants with university degree studies (14 complete and 13 incomplete studies), associate degree courses (11 complete and two incomplete), and high school education (three complete and one incomplete).

The group from Barcelona was born in Spain and was residing in the urban area of Barcelona and its suburban localities (*n* = 32). Their age averaged 41.19 years (*SD* = 13.85, *range* = 20-70). Seventeen were women and fifteen were men. With respect to their education, 26 had completed their university studies, two had completed some university-level education but had not yet earned a degree, one had completed an associate degree, two had completed high school, and one had completed middle school.

The group from Seville was born in Spain and living in the urban area and surroundings of Seville (*n* = 31). Their mean age is 49.90 years (*SD* = 12.99, *range* = 26-68). Eighteen were women and thirteen were men. Concerning education, 25 had completed university studies, two of them had completed some university-level coursework, two of them had completed an associate degree, and two had completed high school.

Data collection

Data collection consisted of two instruments: a background questionnaire and a written clause-elicitation task. The participants completed these tasks online using QuestionPro (QuestionPro Inc., Austin, Texas), a licensed software that provided an encrypted platform to distribute and receive the documents in a confidential way. These tasks were first piloted with a small sample (two participants from each locality) to confirm comprehensibility and task completion time. The pilot also served to verify that the language used in the tasks did not favor any specific Spanish variety, that completion of the task responded to general expectations of the study, and that the online delivery mode was functioning. Minor modifications to the instruments were made following the pilot study.

For data-collection, the recruitment of participants in each local region started with acquaintances of my own networking in the local regions, who helped me to get more participants through their own internal networking. My acquaintances participated in the study, and then, they contacted other volunteers (colleagues at work, friends, family members or acquaintances) who showed interest in taking part. New potential participants were not given information about the investigation by the first participants; they were only told that it was an investigation on Spanish language in which they had to complete a story. When I was given their contact address or number, I made initial contact with each potential participant via WhatsApp or email. I evaluated their qualification to participate (being over 18 years old, having access to the internet and a device to be able to complete the task, and having lived in the region for more than 10 years) and I checked their availability for a second contact (through a call, an extended audio or an extended written message or written text in an email) according to their convenience. In this second stage, I explained to them the purpose of the investigation, I instructed them on how to complete the tasks, and I answered any questions they had. After this, I formally invited them to join in, through an informed consent page on QuestionPro that preceded the tasks. After this, they were able to start completing the two tasks, which took them between 30 to 45 minutes to complete.

The first instrument was a background questionnaire (see Appendices A, B, and C), which provided information regarding age, gender, birthplace, number of years living in the current location, level of education and other personal details (e.g., languages spoken at home during childhood). Although the content of the questions on the background questionnaire were the same for all participants, there were differences in the use of second-person-singular pronouns, in order to reflect regional variation between Argentina and Spain. In the case of Barcelona and Seville, *tú* 'you' and its corresponding verb forms were used, and *vos* 'you' and its verb forms were used for participants in Rosario, Argentina. Second-person-singular pronouns were not used in the dialogue sentences in the clause-elicitation task.

The second instrument, the written clause-elicitation task, consisted of a story written in a conversational mode, about three old friends talking during an informal dinner at a restaurant (see Appendices D and E). The story was divided into thirty segments, each of them containing an introductory sentence uttered by one of the protagonists, with information expected to encourage the participant's engagement in the conversation within the story. This was followed by an initial phrase with a lexical item (e.g., *esperar que*, 'to hope that', or *ser importante que* 'to be important that'), as in the examples 1 and 2 (these lexical items are examples of the individual governors mentioned in the Background-Mood distinction section) and a blank space. This blank space was expected to be completed by the participant, who had to continue the idea or the thread of the conversation. Two of the task items are shown in (1) and (2) below; examples of participant responses, in bold text, accompany the task items. A finite verb corresponding to the subjunctive or indicative mood was included in the continuation of the idea (with very few exceptions in which the participants used infinitive, gerund, or no verb). This verbal mood represented the token that was extracted for analysis. The format of this instrument is comparable to the one used in Gudmestad (2021), although the characters, the circumstances and content of the story, as well as the syntactic structure of the sentences and some of the governors used to elicit verbal moods were different. The design of this instrument took into consideration the independent linguistic variables under study (see Data coding). As mentioned in the Background section, this task served the purpose of eliciting a range of mood-choice contexts and several contexts from each participant.

(1) *Para Tomás, tan idealista como Marina, el cambio en las conciencias de las personas está muy cerca. Mientras levanta su copa, dice:*

"Espero que ***podamos*****SUBJC** ***vivir en armonía por el bien común."*** Participant B55, from Barcelona.

'For Thomas, as idealist as Marina, a change in people's consciousness is very near. While raising his glass to toast, he says:'
'I hope that **we can live in harmony for the common good**.'

(2) *A Pablo le encanta lo que dicen sus amigos, pero sigue sin esperanzas. En un esfuerzo, levanta su copa y expresa su deseo para el futuro:*

"Es importante que ***todos aportemos*****SUBJC** ***nuestro granito de arena****"* Participant A12 from Argentina.

'Pablo is delighted with what his friends have said, but he continues hopeless. In an effort, he raises his glass and expresses his wish for the future:'

'It is important that **every one of us contribute with our small part.**'

Data coding

In the current investigation, a mood-choice context was operationalized as a sentence that contained one of the 30 governors under investigation, followed by a verb (details below). Governors were the lexical items corresponding to the five semantic categories that began the dialogue sentences that participants were asked to complete (*esperar que* and *ser importante que* in examples 1-2). The dependent variable was the verbal mood (subjunctive or indicative) used in a mood-choice context.

Six independent variables were examined in the present study: three linguistic and three extralinguistic. The linguistic factors were individual governors, semantic category, and time reference. The governors were 30 in total and represented five semantic categories (see Table 1). The semantic categories were volition (which conveys desire), comment (which indicates opinion or emotion), temporality (which refers to temporal adverbial conjunctions), uncertainty (which communicates doubt), and assertion (which expresses certainty).

Table 1

Individual Governors and their Semantic Category

Governor	Translation	Semantic category
Ser aconsejable que	To be advisable that	Volition
Desear que	To wish that	Volition
Querer que	To want that	Volition
Preferir que	To prefer that	Volition
Ojalá que	Hopefully	Volition
Esperar que	To hope that	Volition
Gustarle mucho que	To very much like that	Comment
Molestarle que	To find it annoying that	Comment
Ser una lástima que	To be a pity that	Comment
Ser mejor que	To be better than	Comment
Ser importante que	To be important that	Comment
Qué bueno que	To be good that	Comment
Después de que	After	Temporality
Cuando	When	Temporality
Mientras	While	Temporality
Hasta que	Until	Temporality
Tan pronto como	As soon as	Temporality
En cuanto	No sooner	Temporality
Tal vez	Perhaps	Uncertainty
No pensar que	To not think that	Uncertainty
Dudar que	To doubt that	Uncertainty

Table 1 (continued)

Governor	Translation	Semantic Category
No creer que	To not believe that	Uncertainty
No estar seguro de que	To not be sure that	Uncertainty
Ser posible que	To be possible that	Uncertainty
Ser obvio que	To be obvious that	Assertion
Darse cuenta de que	To realize that	Assertion
Creer que	To believe that	Assertion
Estar claro que	To be clear that	Assertion
Estar seguro de que	To be sure that	Assertion
Pensar que	To think that	Assertion

In the examples above, sentence (1) belonged to the semantic category of volition, and sentence (2), to the semantic category of comment. Time reference, the third linguistic independent variable, was present in each segment of the story, referring to the past, present or future, marked by the temporal adverbials and verb forms in those sentences. For example, sentences (1) and (2) belonged to the future-time reference. The three extralinguistic variables were region of residence (Rosario, Argentina, Barcelona, Spain, and Seville, Spain), gender (woman/man), and individual participants.

Data analysis

My analysis consisted primarily of crosstabulations and qualitative comparisons among the regions. I analyzed the data in three stages. At each stage, I examined the three regions separately and made comparisons among them. The goal of the first stage was to distinguish between governors that exhibited variable and categorical mood use and to examine the overall frequency of use of verbal moods. I first conducted crosstabulations to examine the frequency of verbal moods with each individual governor. I examined all mood-choice contexts and then I removed cases in which participants produced a gerund, infinitive, or no verb, so that only those mood-choice contexts that occurred with the subjunctive and indicative remained in the dataset. I then conducted another set of crosstabulations in order to identify governors that exhibited categorical subjunctive use, categorical indicative use, and variable use. Lastly, after removing all the governors that had behaved categorically in each region, I conducted two additional series of crosstabulations—one analyzed the frequency of verbal moods with each variable governor and the other served to compare the overall rates of variable mood use among the three regions.

The goal of the second stage was to analyze how the linguistic independent variables related to mood use in each regional group. I first conducted crosstabulations to observe the frequency of mood use according to semantic category. I further examined this factor by looking again at governors, this time according to their semantic category. Lastly, I conducted crosstabulations to examine the frequency of mood use according to time reference with variable governors across regions.

The goal of the third stage was to analyze extralinguistic variation, by examining how gender and individual participants related to mood use in each region. I conducted crosstabulations to observe frequency of mood use by women and men in each region and compared the use across regions. Lastly, I conducted crosstabulations in order to analyze frequency of mood use by individual participants across the regions. I further examined the extent of variability among individuals by calculating the mean, standard deviation and range of subjunctive use by participants with variable governors for each region.

Results

I begin the presentation of the results with an assessment of the distribution of the various verb forms that participant groups used in the mood-choice contexts under investigation. These forms consist of the subjunctive, indicative, infinitive, and gerund, as well as the lack of a verb form. Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, presented separately for each region, show categorical and variable mood use with the governors that the task was designed to investigate. Governors in the tables exhibit a different order for each region, as they were arranged according to first, categorical subjunctive use, secondly, categorical indicative use, and lastly, variable use from the most to the least subjunctive (see the Appendix F for a complete inventory of all tense/mood/aspect forms that occurred in this dataset).

The results reveal that the number of governors that exhibited categorical subjunctive use were five in Rosario, four in Barcelona, and nine in Seville. Second, the number of governors that showed categorical indicative were five in Rosario, four in Barcelona, and one in Seville. A comparison across tables shows that there were some governors that resulted in categorical use in one region, while they were variable in the other two (e.g., *ser aconsejable que* 'to be advisable that' was categorical for Seville but variable in the rest), and vice versa, some governors resulted in categorical use in two regions, while they were variable in one of them (e.g., *hasta que* 'until' was categorical in Rosario and Seville, but variable in Barcelona). Moreover, there were four governors that resulted in categorical use for all regions (*ojalá que* 'hopefully', *no estar seguro de que* 'to not be sure that', *ser posible que* 'to be possible that', and *darse cuenta de que* 'to realize that').

Table 2.1

Distribution of Verb Forms With Each Governor: Rosario

Governors	Verb Form										Total	
	Subjunctive		Indicative		Infinitive		Gerund		No V.			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ojalá que	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Hasta que	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Tan pronto como	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
No estar seguro de	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Ser posible que	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Ser obvio que	-	-	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Darse cuenta de q.	-	-	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Creer que	-	-	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Estar claro que	-	-	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Pensar que	-	-	44	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Esperar que	43	97.73	1	2.27	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Ser importante que	43	97.73	-	-	1	2.27	-	-	-	-	44	100
En cuanto	43	97.73	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.27	44	100
Ser aconsejable q.	42	95.45	1	2.27	-	-	-	-	1	2.27	44	100
Desear que	42	95.45	1	2.27	1	2.27	-	-	-	-	44	100
Preferir que	42	95.45	-	-	2	4.55	-	-	-	-	44	100
Querer que	41	93.18	-	-	3	6.82	-	-	-	-	44	100
No creer que	41	93.18	3	6.82	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Ser una lástima que	40	90.91	4	9.09	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Dudar que	40	90.91	4	9.09	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Molestarle que	39	88.64	4	9.09	1	2.27	-	-	-	-	44	100
Ser mejor que	38	86.36	-	-	5	11.36	-	-	1	2.27	44	100
Qué bueno que	38	86.36	5	11.36	-	-	-	-	1	2.27	44	100
Gustarle mucho q.	36	81.82	8	18.18	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Mientras	9	20.45	35	79.55	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Cuando	7	15.90	37	84.10	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
No pensar que	6	13.63	37	84.10	1	2.27	-	-	-	-	44	100
Después de que	4	9.09	40	90.91	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Tal vez	2	4.55	42	95.45	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Estar seguro de que	2	4.55	42	96.44	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	100
Total	818	61.97	484	36.67	14	1.06	-	-	4	0.30	1320	100

Table 2.2

Distribution of Verb Forms With Each Governor: Barcelona

Governors	Verb Form										Total	
	Subjunctive		Indicative		Infinitive		Gerund		No V.			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ojalá que	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
No estar seguro de	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Ser posible que	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Ser importante que	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Ser obvio que	-	-	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Darse cuenta de que	-	-	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Creer que	-	-	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Pensar que	-	-	32	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Esperar que	31	96.88	-	-	1	3.12	-	-	-	-	32	100
Gustarle mucho que	31	96.88	1	3.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Ser una lástima que	31	96.88	1	3.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Qué bueno que	31	96.88	1	3.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Tan pronto como	31	96.88	1	3.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Desear que	30	93.75	2	6.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Hasta que	30	93.75	2	6.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
En cuanto	30	93.75	1	3.12	-	-	1	3.12	-	-	32	100
Ser aconsejable que	29	90.63	1	3.12	2	6.25	-	-	-	-	32	100
Querer que	29	90.63	-	-	3	9.37	-	-	-	-	32	100
Preferir que	29	90.63	-	-	3	9.37	-	-	-	-	32	100
Ser mejor que	29	90.63	2	6.25	-	-	-	-	1	3.12	32	100
No creer que	29	90.63	1	3.12	1	3.12	1	3.12	-	-	32	100
Molestarle que	27	84.38	5	15.62	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Dudar que	27	84.38	5	15.62	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Después de que	22	68.75	9	28.13	1	3.12	-	-	-	-	32	100
No pensar que	17	53.12	15	46.87	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Tal vez	7	21.88	25	78.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Cuando	4	12.50	28	87.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Mientras	4	12.5	28	87.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Estar seguro de que	2	6.25	30	93.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100
Estar claro que	1	3.12	31	96.88	-	-	-	--		-	32	100
Total	629	65.52	317	33.02	111	1.15	2	0.21	1	0.10	960	100

Table 2.3

Distribution of Verb Forms With Each Governor: Seville

Governors	Verb Form										Total	
	Subjunctive		Indicative		Infinitive		Gerund		No V.			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ser aconsejable que	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Ojalá que	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Ser importante que	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Hasta que	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Tan pronto como	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
En cuanto	31	100	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
No creer que	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
No estar seguro de q.	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Ser posible que	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Darse cuenta de que	-	-	31	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Desear que	30	96.77	-	-	1	3.23	-	-	-	-	31	100
Esperar que	30	96.77	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.23	31	100
Ser mejor que	30	96.77	-	-	1	3.23	-	-	-	-	31	100
Qué bueno que	30	96.77	1	3.23	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Dudar que	30	96.77	1	3.23	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Querer que	29	93.55	-	-	2	6.45	-	-	-	-	31	100
Preferir que	29	93.55	-	-	2	6.45	-	-	-	-	31	100
Gustarle mucho que	29	93.55	1	3.23	1	3.23	-	-	-	-	31	100
Molestarle que	29	93.55	1	3.23	-	-	-	-	1	3.23	31	100
Ser una lástima	29	93.55	2	6.45	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Después de que	24	77.42	7	22.58	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
No pensar que	16	61.61	15	48.39	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Cuando	10	32.26	21	67.74	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Mientras	7	22.58	24	77.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Tal vez	7	22.58	24	77.42	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Ser obvio que	1	3.23	29	93.54	-	-	-	-	1	3.23	31	100
Creer que	1	3.23	30	96.77	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Estar seguro de que	1	3.23	30	96.77	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	100
Estar claro	-	-	30	96.77	-	-	1	3.23	-	-	31	100
Pensar que	-	-	30	96.77	-	-	-	-	1	3.23	31	100
Total	641	68.92	277	29.78	7	0.75	1	0.11	4	0.43	930	100

To complement these results, Table 3 summarizes the subjunctive, indicative, and 'other forms' (infinitives, gerunds, and lack of verb combined in one column) rates for the three regions in one table, enabling us to compare the total rates shown in Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. The observations suggest potential differences among the regions. The Rosario group used the indicative more and the subjunctive less than the Seville group. The difference in subjunctive and indicative rates between these two groups was 6.95 percent and 6.89 percent, respectively. The rates of use of both verbal moods in Barcelona were in between those found in the other regions. The use of other forms is low (less than 1.5% for each group).

Table 3

Frequency of Verb Forms Across Regions for All Governors

Region	Verb Form						Total
	Subjunctive		Indicative		Other		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Rosario	818	61.97	484	36.67	18	1.36	1320
Barcelona	629	65.52	317	33.02	14	1.46	960
Seville	641	68.92	277	29.78	12	1.30	930

Next, by removing the infinitives, gerunds, and other instances where participants did not produce a verb, the distribution of mood use at this stage revealed a larger number of categorical governors in each region. Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 are organized similarly to Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, displaying firstly the governors with categorical use, and subsequently, those with variable use, from most to least subjunctive. In a task of 30 items, the results indicate that there were 15 categorical governors for Rosario (10 in the subjunctive and five in the indicative mood), 11 for Barcelona (seven in the subjunctive and four in the indicative mood), and 17 for Seville (14 in the subjunctive and three in the indicative mood).

Table 4.1

Distribution of Verb Forms With Each Governor: Rosario

Governors	Verb form				Total	
	Subjunctive		Indicative			
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ojalá que	44	100	-	-	44	100
Hasta que	44	100	-	-	44	100
Tan pronto como	44	100	-	-	44	100
No estar seguro de que	44	100	-	-	44	100
Ser posible que	44	100	-	-	44	100
Ser imposible que	43	100	-	-	43	100
En cuanto	43	100	-	-	43	100
Preferir que	42	100	-	-	42	100
Querer que	41	100	-	-	41	100
Ser mejor que	38	100	-	-	38	100
Ser obvio que	-	-	44	100	44	100
Darse cuenta de que	-	-	44	100	44	100
Creer que	-	-	44	100	44	100
Estar claro que	-	-	44	100	44	100
Pensar que	-	-	44	100	44	100
Esperar que	43	97.73	1	2.27	44	100
Ser aconsejable que	42	97.67	1	2.33	43	100
Desear que	42	97.67	1	2.33	43	100
No creer que	41	93.18	3	6.82	44	100
Ser una lástima que	40	90.91	4	9.09	44	100
Dudar que	40	90.91	4	9.09	44	100
Molestarle que	39	90.70	4	9.30	43	100
Qué bueno que	38	88.37	5	11.36	43	100
Gustarle mucho que	36	81.82	8	18.18	44	100
Mientras	9	20.45	35	79.55	44	100
Cuando	7	15.90	37	84.10	44	100
No pensar que	6	13.95	37	86.05	43	100
Después de que	4	9.09	40	90.91	44	100
Tal vez	2	4.55	42	95.45	44	100
Estar seguro de que	2	4.55	42	95.45	44	100
Total	818	62.83	484	37.17	1302	100

Table 4.2

Distribution of Verb Forms With Each Governor: Barcelona

Governors	Verb form				Total	
	Subjunctive		Indicative			
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ojalá que	32	100	-	-	32	100
Ser importante que	32	100	-	-	32	100
No estar seguro de que	32	100	-	-	32	100
Ser posible que	32	100	-	-	32	100
Esperar que	31	100	-	-	31	100
Querer que	29	100	-	-	29	100
Preferir que	29	100	-	-	29	100
Ser obvio que	-	-	32	100	32	100
Darse cuenta de que	-	-	32	100	32	100
Creer que	-	-	32	100	32	100
Pensar que	-	-	32	100	32	100
Gustarle mucho que	31	96.88	1	3.12	32	100
Ser una lástima que	31	96.88	1	3.12	32	100
Qué bueno	31	96.88	1	3.12	32	100
Tan pronto como	31	96.88	1	3.12	32	100
En cuanto	30	96.77	1	3.23	31	100
Ser aconsejable que	29	96.67	1	3.33	30	100
No creer que	29	96.67	1	3.33	30	100
Desear que	30	93.75	2	6.25	32	100
Hasta que	30	93.75	2	6.25	32	100
Ser mejor que	29	93.55	2	6.45	31	100
Molestarle que	27	84.38	5	15.62	32	100
Dudar que	27	84.38	5	15.62	32	100
Después de que	22	70.97	9	29.03	31	100
No pensar que	17	53.12	15	46.87	32	100
Tal vez	7	21.88	25	78.12	32	100
Cuando	4	12.50	28	87.50	32	100
Mientras	4	12.50	28	87.50	32	100
Estar seguro de que	2	6.25	30	93.75	32	100
Estar claro que	1	3.12	31	96.88	32	100
Total	629	66.49	317	33.51	946	100

Table 4.3

Distribution of Verb Forms With Each Governor: Seville

Governors	Verb form				Total	
	Subjunctive		Indicative			
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ser aconsejable que	31	100	-	-	31	100
Ojalá que	31	100	-	-	31	100
Ser importante que	31	100	-	-	31	100
Hasta que	31	100	-	-	31	100
Tan pronto como	31	100	-	-	31	100
En cuanto	31	100	-	-	31	100
No creer que	31	100	-	-	31	100
No estar seguro de que	31	100	-	-	31	100
Ser posible que	31	100	-	-	31	100
Desear que	30	100	-	-	30	100
Esperar que	30	100	-	-	30	100
Ser mejor que	30	100	-	-	30	100
Querer que	29	100	-	-	29	100
Preferir que	29	100	-	-	29	100
Darse cuenta de que	-	-	31	100	31	100
Estar claro que	-	-	30	100	30	100
Pensar que	-	-	30	100	30	100
Qué bueno que	30	96.77	1	3.23	31	100
Dudar que	30	96.77	1	3.23	31	100
Gustarle mucho que	29	96.67	1	3.33	30	100
Molestarle que	29	96.67	1	3.33	30	100
Ser una lástima que	29	93.54	2	6.45	31	100
Después de que	24	77.42	7	22.58	31	100
No pensar que	16	61.61	15	48.39	31	100
Cuando	10	32.26	21	67.74	31	100
Mientras	7	22.58	24	77.42	31	100
Tal vez	7	22.58	24	77.42	31	100
Ser obvio que	1	3.33	29	93.67	30	100
Creer que	1	3.23	30	96.67	31	100
Estar seguro de que	1	3.23	30	96.67	31	100
Total	641	69.83	277	30.17	918	100

Table 5 summarizes the information provided in Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 and allows us to compare the overall frequencies of indicative and subjunctive mood across the regions. Seville used the subjunctive most often with all governors (69.83%), followed by Barcelona (66.49%) and lastly, by Rosario (62.83%). The total rates of subjunctive and indicative mood use across the regions maintained the same general trend as seen in Table 3, with Rosario and Seville presenting the largest difference between them. The difference between the highest and lowest frequency of subjunctive and indicative was seven percent for both moods.

Table 5

Frequency of Verb Forms Across Regions for All Governors Without Other Forms

Region	Verb Form				Total
	Subjunctive		Indicative		
	#	%	#	%	
Rosario	818	62.83	484	37.17	1302
Barcelona	629	66.49	317	33.51	946
Seville	641	69.83	277	30.17	918

In what follows, Table 6, with the governors organized from most to least subjunctive, provides an overview of which governors are categorical and variable for each region, when only cases where participants produced the subjunctive and indicative are considered. This comparison reveals three general similarities. First, there were 11 governors that exhibited variable use for all three regions (e.g., *estar seguro de que* ‘to be sure that’). Additionally, regarding categorical use across the three regions, six governors occurred exclusively with the subjunctive mood, (e.g., *querer que* ‘to want that’) and two governors exhibited categorical indicative use (e.g., *darse cuenta de que* ‘to realize that’). There are also three overarching differences. One is that three governors were variable for one of the three participant groups, but categorical with the subjunctive in the two others (e.g., *esperar que* ‘to hope that’) was variable for Rosario, but it was categorical in Barcelona and Seville). Another difference is that two governors were variable for one region, but categorical with the indicative for the rest (e.g., *creer que* ‘to believe that’) was variable for Seville, but categorical in Rosario and Barcelona). Third, three governors occurred categorically with the subjunctive mood in Seville, whereas they were variable in Rosario and Barcelona (e.g., *desear que* ‘to wish that’).

Table 6

Overview of Categorical and Variable Governors per Region

Governors	Region		
	Rosario	Barcelona	Seville
Querer que	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.
Preferir que	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.
Ojalá que	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.
Ser importante que	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.
No estar seguro de que	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.
Ser posible que	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.
Hasta que	Categ. Subj.	Variable	Categ. Subj.
Tan pronto como	Categ. Subj.	Variable	Categ. Subj.
En cuanto	Categ. Subj.	Variable	Categ. Subj.
Ser mejor que	Categ. Subj.	Variable	Categ. Subj.
Esperar que	Variable	Categ. Subj.	Categ. Subj.
Ser aconsejable que	Variable	Variable	Categ. Subj.
Desear que	Variable	Variable	Categ. Subj.
No creer que	Variable	Variable	Categ. Subj.
Darse cuenta de que	Categ. Ind.	Categ. Ind.	Categ. Ind.
Pensar que	Categ. Ind.	Categ. Ind.	Categ. Ind.
Estar claro que	Categ. Ind.	Variable	Categ. Ind.
Ser obvio que	Categ. Ind.	Categ. Ind.	Variable
Creer que	Categ. Ind.	Categ. Ind.	Variable
Gustarle mucho que	Variable	Variable	Variable
Molestarle que	Variable	Variable	Variable
Ser una lástima que	Variable	Variable	Variable
Qué bueno que	Variable	Variable	Variable
Después de que	Variable	Variable	Variable

Table 6 (continued)

Governors	Region		
	Rosario	Barcelona	Seville
Cuando	Variable	Variable	Variable
Mientras que	Variable	Variable	Variable
Tal vez	Variable	Variable	Variable
No pensar que	Variable	Variable	Variable
Dudar que	Variable	Variable	Variable
Estar seguro de que	Variable	Variable	Variable

From this point onwards, the purpose of the analysis is to focus on contexts of variation. To allow for this, all categorical governors were removed from each region's dataset. At this stage, it can be observed that the trend that characterized the frequencies of subjunctive use with all governors (Table 3), in which Seville showed the highest subjunctive use and Rosario showed the lowest, has changed. Table 7 indicates that the Barcelona group used the subjunctive mood most often with variable governors (68.55%), followed by the Rosario group (59.69%) and lastly, by Seville (53.25%). The difference between the regions that used the subjunctive most and least often with variable governors was 15.30 percent.

Table 7

Frequency of Verb Forms Across Regions for Variable Governors

Region	Verb Form				Total
	Subjunctive		Indicative		
	#	%	#	%	
Rosario	391	59.69	264	40.31	655
Barcelona	412	68.55	189	31.45	601
Seville	213	53.25	187	46.75	400

The next objective was to perform an analysis of the distribution of mood according to the other independent variables. Beginning with semantic category, Table 8 is organized, for the most part, by frequency of subjunctive use, from the highest to the lowest rate, with the exception of uncertainty and temporality for Barcelona. The results revealed similarities and differences among the regions. Regarding similarities, overall, the highest rate of subjunctive use was produced with the category of volition. This category does not appear for Seville on this table as participants used the subjunctive categorically with governors of volition. Secondly, considering the category that exhibited variable use with at least some governors in all regions, comment was the one with the highest rate of subjunctive. Thirdly, the semantic category of uncertainty triggered the most variation between moods in all regions, as the percentage values in the three regions were closer to 50 percent, indicating alternation of mood use with these governors. Lastly, all regions produced the highest rate of the indicative with variable governors under the semantic category of assertion. The most noticeable difference pertains to the semantic category of temporality; the participants in Rosario used the subjunctive less frequently (15.15%) than participants in Barcelona and Seville (63.68% and 44.09%, respectively).

The results from the examination of the distribution of verbal moods by semantic category across regions prompted the need for a more detailed analysis. Thus, I revisited the independent variable of individual governors. Table 9 illustrates the rate of mood use for variable governors for all regions, this time organized by semantic category. First, I made a few preliminary observations by comparing only governors that exhibited variable use in all three regions. By calculating the range of subjunctive use with each variable governor across regions, I noticed that some governors exhibited greater differences. In particular, *después de que* 'after' (*range* = 67.52%) and *no pensar que* 'to not think that' (*range* = 47.66%) exhibited the greatest difference, whereas *ser una lástima que* ‘to be a pity that’ (*range* = 5.97%) and *estar seguro de que* ‘to be sure that’ (*range* = 3.02%) were the two governors that were most similar across regions.

Table 8

Distribution of Semantic Category for Variable Governors across Regions

Semantic Category	Rosario				Barcelona				Seville			
	Subj		Indic		Subj		Indic		Subj		Indic	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Volition	127	97.69	3	2.31	59	95.16	3	4.84	-	-	-	-
Comment	153	87.93	21	12.07	149	93.71	10	6.29	117	95.90	5	4.10
Uncertainty	89	50.86	86	49.14	80	63.49	46	36.51	52	55.91	41	44.09
Temporality	20	15.15	112	84.85	121	63.68	69	36.32	41	44.09	52	55.91
Assertion	2	4.55	42	95.45	3	4.69	61	95.31	3	3.26	89	96.74
Total	391	59.69	264	40.31	412	68.55	189	31.45	213	53.25	187	46.75

Table 9

Distribution of Verb Forms With Each Variable Governor Across Regions

Semantic category	Governor	Rosario				Barcelona				Seville			
		Subjunctive		Indicative		Subjunctive		Indicative		Subjunctive		Indicative	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Volition	*Ser aconsejable q.*	42	97.67	1	2.33	29	96.67	1	3.33	-	-	-	-
Volition	*Desear que*	42	97.67	1	2.33	30	93.75	2	6.25	-	-	-	-
Volition	*Esperar que*	43	97.73	1	2.27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comment	*Gustarle mucho q.*	36	81.82	8	18.18	31	96.88	1	3.12	29	96.67	1	3.33
Comment	*Molestarle que*	39	90.70	4	9.30	27	84.38	5	15.62	29	96.67	1	3.33
Comment	*Ser una lástima q.*	40	90.91	4	9.09	31	96.88	1	3.12	29	93.54	2	6.45
Comment	*Ser mejor que*	-	-	-	-	29	93.55	2	6.45	-	-	-	-
Comment	*Qué bueno que*	38	88.37	5	11.36	31	96.88	1	3.12	30	96.77	1	3.23
Temporality	*Después de que*	4	9.90	40	90.91	22	70.97	9	29.03	24	77.42	7	22.58
Temporality	*Cuando*	7	15.90	37	84.10	4	12.50	28	87.50	10	32.26	21	67.74
Temporality	*Mientras*	9	20.45	35	79.55	4	12.50	28	87.50	7	22.58	24	77.42
Temporality	*Hasta que*	-	-	-	-	30	93.75	2	6.25	-	-	-	-
Temporality	*Tan pronto como*	-	-	-	-	31	96.88	1	3.12	-	-	-	-
Temporality	*En cuanto*	-	-	-	-	30	96.77	1	3.23	-	-	-	-
Uncertainty	*Tal vez*	2	4.55	42	95.45	7	21.88	25	78.12	7	22.58	24	77.42
Uncertainty	*No pensar que*	6	13.95	37	86.05	17	53.12	15	46.87	16	61.61	15	48.39
Uncertainty	*Dudar que*	40	90.91	4	9.09	27	84.38	5	15.62	30	96.77	1	3.23
Uncertainty	*No creer que*	41	93.18	3	6.82	29	96.67	1	3.33	-	-	-	-
Assertion	*Ser obvio que*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.33	29	93.67
Assertion	*Creer que*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.23	30	96.77
Assertion	*Estar claro que*	-	-	-	-	1	3.12	31	96.88	-	-	-	-
Assertion	*Estar seguro de q.*	2	4.55	42	96.44	2	6.25	30	93.75	1	3.23	30	96.77
Total		391	59.69	264	40.31	412	68.55	189	31.45	214	53.50	186	46.50

Next, I continued to examine individual governors that are grouped into the same semantic category. Governors of volition showed a rate of subjunctive use above 90 percent in all cases where there was variation. Under the semantic category of comment, most governors exhibited a rate of subjunctive use that was above 90 percent as well, with the exceptions of *gustarle mucho que* 'to like very much that' and *qué bueno que* 'how good that' in Rosario, and *molestarle que* 'to bother that' in Barcelona. These three governors, though, still occurred with the subjunctive a majority of the time. In Seville, the subjunctive was used more than 93 percent of the time with each comment governor. Concerning governors of temporality, *hasta que* 'until', *tan pronto como* 'as soon as' and *en cuanto* 'as soon as', which were categorical for the subjunctive in Rosario and Seville, exhibited a rate of subjunctive use above 90 percent in Barcelona, where only one participant used the indicative with *tan pronto como* 'as soon as' and *en cuanto* 'as soon as', and only two participants used the indicative with *hasta que* 'until'. This demonstrates that the three regions appear to be similar in their high use of the subjunctive with these governors. The rest of the temporality governors showed subjunctive rates lower than 33 percent, except for *después de que* 'after' in Barcelona and Seville, with a rate of around 71 and 78 percent, respectively. Governors of uncertainty showed diverse rates of subjunctive use. All regions used the subjunctive with *dudar que* 'to doubt that' and *no creer que* 'to not believe that' a majority of the time, with the lowest rate of subjunctive use occurring with *dudar que* 'to doubt that' in Barcelona (84.38%). *tal vez* 'perhaps' and *no pensar que* 'to not think that' showed much lower rates of subjunctive use in Rosario (4.55% and 13.95%, respectively) in comparison with Barcelona and Seville (Barcelona: 21.88% and 53.12%, and Seville: 22.58% and 61.61%, respectively). Below is an example (1) of a context with one of these governors, *no pensar que* ‘to not think that’, for the three regions, in which Barcelona exhibited subjunctive use, and the other two regions, indicative mood use:

(1) Mientras salen del bar, …

While they are leaving the bar, …

1a. Marina dice: “No pensé que fuéramos$_{\underline{\text{SUBJC}}}$ *a cerrar el bar.”* Participant B59 from Barcelona.

‘Marina says: I did not think we were to close the bar.’

1b. Marina dice: “*No pensé que me sentiría*$_{\underline{\text{INDIC}}}$ *tan bien*.” Participant A27 from Argentina.

‘Marina says: “I did not think I would feel so good.’

1c. Marina dice: “No pensé que lo iba$_{\underline{\text{INDIC}}}$ *a pasar tan bien*.” Participant S88 from Seville.

‘I did not think I was going to have such a good time.’

Lastly, assertion governors displayed rates of subjunctive use below 7 percent in all cases of variation, with just one or two participants using the subjunctive with any given governors of assertion.

The next objective was to analyze the independent variable of time reference in relation to mood use. Table 10 shows the distribution of subjunctive and indicative mood use,

Table 10

Distribution of Time Reference for Variable Governors Across Regions

Time Reference	Rosario				Barcelona				Seville			
	Subj.		Indic.		Subj.		Indic.		Subj.		Indic.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Future	83	63.36	48	36.64	94	74.02	33	25.98	30	48.39	32	51.61
Present	130	73.86	46	26.14	151	68.33	70	31.67	67	54.03	57	45.97
Past	178	51.15	170	48.85	167	66.01	86	33.99	115	53.74	99	46.26
Total	391	59.69	264	40.31	412	68.55	189	31.45	213	53.25	187	46.75

according to time reference with variable governors. By analyzing the most and least subjunctive use with each time reference exhibited across regions, some observations can be made. The categories that showed the highest rates of subjunctive use were the future time reference in Barcelona (74.02%) and the present time reference in Rosario (73.86%). In Seville, on the other hand, higher rates of subjunctive were seen in past- and present-time contexts, where these two categories were similar to each other (53.74% and 54.03%, respectively). Example (2) below illustrates a context of past time reference comparing the regions, where Seville showed use of subjunctive, in contrast to the other two regions that exhibited indicative mood use:

(2) Tomás quien tuvo un bebé con su pareja el año pasado, dice:

Tomas, who had a baby with his couple last year, says:

2 a. "Me sentí muy feliz y no he parado de aprender cosas nuevas después de que naciera$_{\underline{\text{SUBJC}}}$ *el bebé."* Participant S96 from Seville.

'I felt very happy and have not stopped learning things after the baby was born.'

2 b. "Me sentí muy feliz y no he parado de aprender cosas nuevas después de que tuve$_{\underline{\text{INDIC}}}$ *mi primera hija.*" Participant B67 from Barcelona.

'I felt very happy and have not stopped learning things after I had my first child.'

2 c. "Me sentí muy feliz y no he parado de aprender cosas nuevas después de que nació$_{\underline{\text{INDIC}}}$ *mi beba.* Participant A15 from Argentina.

'I felt very happy and have not stopped learning things after my baby was born.'

In terms of the time reference category that showed the lowest rate of subjunctive use, Rosario used the subjunctive least often in past-time contexts (51.15%). In Seville, the lowest rate of subjunctive use was in future-time contexts (48.39%) and, in Barcelona, the rate of subjunctive occurrence was similar between the present-time (68.33%) and past-time (66.01%) contexts. It is important to point out that while the Seville group showed differences among time references in its absolute frequencies, this group did not present dramatic differences when considering the percentages. This can be confirmed when comparing the ranges of subjunctive use within each time reference for each region. The results indicate that Rosario showed a range of 22.71 percent, whereas Barcelona showed a range of 8.01 percent and Seville, a range of 5.64 percent of subjunctive use within each time reference.

After having analyzed the three independent linguistic factors, the next step was to center on social variation, by examining the relationship between the use of verbal moods and the external factor of gender (see Table 11). When all regions are compared, a similarity is seen between genders, in that both women and men used the subjunctive more than the indicative with the variable governors under investigation. However, within each region, the rate of subjunctive use between genders appeared to vary. Men used the subjunctive slightly more than women in Rosario (men: 61.19%, women: 58.66%) and in Barcelona (men: 70.67%, women: 66.67%), whereas in Seville women produced the subjunctive slightly more than men (men: 51.81%, women: 54.70%). Another observation emerged regarding the difference in use of subjunctive by men and women in each region. The largest difference between genders was displayed in the Barcelona group, with a difference of use of four percent, in contrast to slightly narrower differences between men and women in Seville (2.89%) and Rosario (2.53%).

Table 11

Frequency of Verb Forms According to Gender

Gender	Rosario				Barcelona				Seville			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Subjunctive	227	58.66	164	61.19	212	66.67	200	70.67	128	54.70	86	51.81
Indicative	160	41.34	104	38.81	106	33.33	83	29.33	106	45.30	80	48.19
Total	387	100	268	100	318	100	283	100	234	100	166	10.02
Subj. range	2.53				4.00				2.89			

The last stage in the analysis was to focus on individual variation, by examining participants' mood use. Tables 12.1, 12.2, and 12.3 show the distribution of mood use by each individual participant with variable governors, presented separate for each region. At quick glance it is apparent that there is variation in the rate of mood use across participants in each region. In terms of the individuals in each region who produced the subjunctive most often, we see that the highest subjunctive user was in Barcelona (84.21%), followed by Rosario (73.33%), and lastly, in Seville (61.54%). The lowest subjunctive user, on the other hand, was in Rosario (33.33%), followed by Barcelona (44.44%) and then by Seville (46.15%).

Table 12.1

Mood Use by Participants for Variable Governors: Rosario

Participants	Subjunctive		Indicative		Total Governors
	#	%	#	%	
A01	8	53.33	7	46.67	15
A02	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A03	8	57.14	6	42.86	14
A04	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A05	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A06	11	73.33	4	26.67	15
A07	8	53.33	7	46.67	15
A08	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A09	7	50.00	7	50.00	14
A10	11	73.33	4	26.67	15
A11	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A12	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A13	8	57.14	6	42.86	14
A14	6	40.00	9	60.00	15
A15	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A16	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A17	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A18	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A19	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A20	6	40.00	9	60.00	15
A21	8	57.14	6	42.86	14
A22	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A23	8	53.33	7	46.67	15
A24	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A25	5	33.33	10	66.67	15
A26	7	46.67	8	53.33	15
A27	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A28	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A29	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A30	12	80.00	3	20.00	15
A31	7	50.00	7	50.00	14
A32	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A33	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A34	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A35	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A36	9	60.00	6	40.00	15

Table 12.1 (continued)

Participants	Subjunctive		Indicative		Total Governors
	#	%	#	%	
A37	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A38	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
A39	7	46.67	8	53.33	15
A40	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A41	11	73.33	4	26.67	15
A42	10	66.67	5	33.33	15
A43	8	53.33	7	46.67	15
A44	9	60.00	6	40.00	15
Total	391	59.69	264	40.31	655

Table 12.2

Mood Use by Participants for Variable Governors: Barcelona

Participants	Subjunctive		Indicative		Total Governors
	#	%	#	%	
B45	13	72.22	5	27.78	18
B46	13	72.22	5	27.78	18
B47	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B48	10	52.63	9	47.37	19
B49	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B50	8	44.44	10	55.56	18
B51	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B52	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B53	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B54	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B55	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B56	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B57	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B58	11	61.11	7	38.89	18
B59	11	61.11	7	38.89	18
B60	12	63.16	7	36.84	19
B61	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B62	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B63	14	73.68	5	26.32	19

Table 12.2 (continued)

Participants	Subjunctive		Indicative		Total Governors
	#	%	#	%	
B64	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B65	15	78.95	4	21.05	19
B66	13	72.22	5	27.78	18
B67	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B68	19	68.42	6	31.58	19
B69	13	68.42	6	31.58	19
B70	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B71	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B72	14	73.68	5	26.32	19
B73	11	57.89	8	42.11	19
B74	15	78.95	4	21.05	19
B75	8	44.44	10	55.56	18
B76	16	84.21	3	15.79	19
Total	412	68.55	189	31.45	601

Table 12.3

Mood Use by Participants for Variable Governors: Seville

Participants	Subjunctive		Indicative		Total Governors
	#	%	#	%	
S77	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S78	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S79	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S80	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S81	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S82	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S83	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S84	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S85	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S86	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S87	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S88	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S89	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S90	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S91	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S92	6	46.15	7	53.85	13

Table 12.3 (continued)

Participants	Subjunctive		Indicative		Total Governors
	#	%	#	%	
S93	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S94	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S95	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S96	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S97	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S98	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S99	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S100	7	53.85	6	46.15	13
S101	4	36.36	7	63.64	11
S102	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S103	8	61.54	5	38.46	13
S104	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S105	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
S106	6	50.00	6	50.00	12
S107	6	46.15	7	53.85	13
Total	214	53.50	186	46.50	400

A summary of the analysis of the individuals is provided in Table 13. This table displays the mean (*M*), standard deviation (*SD*), and range of subjunctive use by participants with variable governors for each region. With respect to the mean, the results revealed that participants in Barcelona used subjunctive mood most often, and participants in Seville produced the subjunctive least often. Regarding the *SD*, there appeared to be slightly more individual variability in Rosario than Seville (with Barcelona falling between the two). The range for each region reinforces the observations made with the *SD*s. The Rosario group exhibited the widest range of subjunctive use by individual participants with variable governors (40%), similar to the Barcelona group (39.77%). It is important to highlight the difference of the Seville group, which showed a narrower range of subjunctive use in comparison to the other two groups (25.18%).

Table 13

Percentage of Subjunctive Use According to Region

Region	*M*	*SD*	Range
Rosario	59.65	9.26	33.33 -73.33
Barcelona	68.47	8.81	44.44 - 84.21
Seville	53.41	7.20	36.36 - 61.54

Discussion

In this section, I return to my research questions and answer them according to the results in the current study. Then, I compare my findings with those in the target investigation. Following that comparison, I discuss the current study's findings in relation to those of other investigations. It is important to remark that making comparisons may be more challenging when the means of analysis and analytical procedures are different. Nevertheless, I make comparisons based on general observations across studies. I conclude this chapter with a brief summary, focusing on commonalities with prior research on variable mood use in Spanish. I also identify the implications of this work for advancing the understanding of the phenomenon under investigation and highlight the unique contribution of my study.

Categorical and Variable Governors

It will be recalled that the first research question pertained to the identification of the governors that exhibited categorical and variable mood use and a comparison among Rosario, Barcelona, and Seville. I focus my discussion of the results on the subset of the data that includes only subjunctive and indicative forms. Considering all three regions, some similar patterns were found in mood use with the 30 governors on the task. For all three regions, mood use was variable with 11 governors (e.g., *molestarle que* 'to bother that', *ser una lástima que* 'to be a pity that') and categorical with eight governors —six with the subjunctive (e.g., *querer que* 'to want that', *ojalá que* 'hopefully') and two with the indicative (e.g., darse *cuenta de que* "to realize that', *pensar que* "to think that'). For the remaining 11 governors, at least one region exhibited categorical use and at least one region exhibited variable use. For example, *ser aconsejable que* 'to be advisable that' showed categorical subjunctive use in Seville, while it was variable in Rosario and Barcelona, and *ser obvio que* 'to be obvious that' exhibited variable use in Seville and categorical indicative use in Rosario and Barcelona. Overall, the group that exhibited categorical use with the highest number of governors was Seville (17 governors), followed by Rosario (15 governors), and last, by Barcelona (11 governors). It is important to point out that categorical use with governors, although distributed differently among the regions, was present in both moods—subjunctive and indicative—in all three participant groups. Table 14 displays a comparison of the governors that showed categorical subjunctive use for all regions, categorical indicative use for all regions, variable use for all regions, and those that exhibited categorical or variable use differently across regions.

Table 14

Categorical and Variable Governors Across Regions

Categorical Subjc. – All Regions	Categorical Indic. – All Regions	Variable – All Regions	Differences Across Regions
Querer que	*Darse cuenta de q.*	*Gustarle mucho q.*	*Hasta que*
Preferir que	*Pensar que*	*Molestarle que*	*Tan pronto como*
Ojalá que		*Ser una lástima que*	*En cuanto*
Ser importante que		*Qué bueno que*	*Ser mejor que*
No estar seguro de q.		*Después de que*	*Esperar que*
Ser posible que		*Cuando*	*Ser aconsejable que*
		Mientras que	*Desear que*
		Tal vez	*No creer que*
		No pensar que	*Estar claro que*
		Dudar que	*Ser obvio que*
		Estar seguro de que	*Creer que*

With respect to the target study's findings in comparison with the current one, I will make two general observations considering the whole set of governors. Then, I will focus only on the governors that were the same for both studies. Overall, there was a similarity between both investigations in that all the regions exhibited variable use with just over a third of the governors. Regarding a difference, in Gudmestad (2021) no governors exhibited categorical mood use for all three regions, whereas in the current study eight governors exhibited categorical mood use for all three regions.

Next, I focus on the set of 19 governors in common in both studies. Table 15 shows a comparison of mood use with governors across regions for both studies. Whereas four governors exhibited variable mood use in all six regions (*gustar que* ‘to like that’, *después de que* ‘after’, *mientras* ‘while’, and *tal vez* ‘perhaps’), the other 15 governors exhibited differences across regions. Among these differences, it may be observed that two governors (*pensar que* ‘to think that’ and *ser posible que* ‘to be possible that’) showed categorical mood use in all regions in the current study while they exhibited variable mood use in all regions in the target one. For the remaining 11 governors, there was not a clear divide between studies in terms of categorical and variable use. For example, whereas *cuando* ‘when’ was variable for each region in the current study, this governor was variable in two of the three regions in Gudmestad (2021). A final observation pertains to Seville—the one geographical area in common between the two studies. For the 19 governors in Table 15, the two studies showed similar results for nine governors (five were variable and four were categorical in both studies). The remaining 11 differed between the two studies, which may reinforce the role that other linguistic and extralinguistic factors play in variable mood use. In sum, it may be noted that Table 15 yields more differences than similarities with governors across regions in both investigations.

In addition, comparing the current and target studies, we can observe that the degree of variation with governors appeared to be higher for two of the regions in Gudmestad (2021). Evidence of this is shown by comparing the numbers in the two final rows of Table 15. These columns reveal that the number of variable governors in the current study was 12 for Barcelona, nine for Rosario, and eight for Seville, whereas in the target study, the number of variable governors was 19 for Mérida, 14 for Quito, and 12 for Seville. One region in each study presented the same number of variable governors (12 governors for Barcelona, in the present study, and Seville, in the target study), although the regions of Mérida and Quito in Gudmestad (2021) exhibited a larger number of variable governors than the regions of Rosario and Seville in my study. In this sense, whereas variation of mood was observed in both studies across the regions under investigation, the degree of this variation with governors appeared to be slightly higher in the target study in relation to the current one.

Considering the observations resulting from comparing mood use with governors across the six regions analyzed in the current and target studies, as previously mentioned, we not only find differences in the patterns of use of individual governors but there also appears to be different degrees of variation. These observations suggest, first, that the envelope of variation for mood use may diverge across regions and, second, that these envelopes of variation might be explained in part by the differing patterns of use with individual governors across regions.

Table 15

Categorical and Variable Governors for the Current and Target Studies

Governors	The Current Study			Gudmestad (2021)		
	Rosario	Barcelona	Seville	Quito	Mérida	Seville
Gustarle que	V	V	V	V	V	V
Después de que	V	V	V	V	V	V
Mientras	V	V	V	V	V	V
Tal vez	V	V	V	V	V	V
Cuando	V	V	V	C	V	V
No pensar que	V	V	V	V	V	C
Dudar que	V	V	V	C	V	C
Estar claro que	C	V	C	V	V	V
No creer que	V	V	C	V	V	V
Esperar que	V	C	C	V	V	V

Table 15 (continued)

Governors	The Current Study			Gudmestad (2021)		
	Rosario	Barcelona	Seville	Quito	Mérida	Seville
Hasta que	C	V	C	V	V	V
Tan pronto como	C	V	C	C	V	V
En cuanto	C	V	C	V	V	C
Creer que	C	C	V	V	V	C
Pensar que	C	C	C	V	V	V
Ser posible que	C	C	C	V	V	V
Ojalá	C	C	C	C	V	C
Preferir que	C	C	C	C	V	C
Querer que	C	C	C	V	V	C
# categorical	10	7	11	5	0	7
# variable	9	12	8	14	19	12

Note. ‘C’ denotes categorical use and ‘V’ signifies variable use.

Previous research that has studied governors in relation to mood use has also found categorical and variable use with individual governors. Because there are differences across studies in the governors that were examined, I limit my discussion to general observations. Across studies, some governors were categorical with the indicative and categorical with the subjunctive, but there was also variation. For example, considering certain governors in common between the current and other studies, in Dunlap (2006), *después de que* ‘after’ was categorical with the subjunctive in Spain and variable in Mexico, with a high preference for the indicative, whereas in the current study it was variable in all the regions. In Gudmestad (2012), *ojalá* ‘hopefully’, *preferir* ‘to prefer’ *y querer* ‘to want’ were categorical with the subjunctive, in consonance with the current study’s results with these governors. In Schwenter and Hoff (2020) (focused on Argentina, Mexico, and Spain) *dudar que* ‘doubt that’ was variable just like in the current study. However, there was a difference with *creer que* ‘to believe that’, which was variable in their study, whereas in the current study this governor was categorical with the indicative for two regions and variable for one region. Lastly, in Deshors and Waltermire (2019), *tal vez* ‘perhaps’ was variable just like in the current study; but *ser posible que* ‘to be possible that’ was variable (although with high preference for the subjunctive), while in the current study this governor was categorical with the subjunctive. Thus, like prior studies, the current study found that the categorical and variable nature of mood use differed among governors, which reinforces the existing observation that governors are important when it comes to understanding variation in mood use (see the Sociolinguistic Factors Related to Mood Use subsection for additional reflection on individual governors).

Frequency of Verbal Moods

The second research question aims to compare the frequency of verbal moods among the places of residence under investigation. From the dataset including only subjunctive and indicative forms, the overall frequencies of mood use showed that Seville used the subjunctive most often with all governors, followed by Barcelona, and lastly, by Rosario. The difference between the highest and lowest frequency of subjunctive use across regions was seven percent. Once the categorical governors were removed from the dataset and the frequency of verbal moods was reassessed, the range of subjunctive use turned larger (15.30%), and the trend of frequencies of mood use across regions changed. That is, Barcelona appeared as the region that exhibited the highest rate of subjunctive use with variable governors, followed by Rosario and lastly by Seville.

With respect to the frequency of verbal moods among places of residence, the target and current study’s findings are alike in that slightly different rates of subjunctive and indicative mood use were found across the three regions. However, there is a difference between both studies in that the ranges of subjunctive use among regions in the target study were narrower than the current study. Considering all governors in Gudmestad (2021), the range of subjunctive use among the regions was 4.80 percent (compared to 7% in the current study), and with only variable governors it was 12.10 percent (compared to 15.30% in the present study). This comparison suggests that, at least with the governors and places of residence under investigation, there is more geographic variation in the rate of subjunctive use in the current study than in Gudmestad (2021). There are two other commonalities between both studies. First, the range of subjunctive use turned wider among regions in both studies once the categorical governors were removed from analysis. Second, the place of residence that exhibited the highest rate of subjunctive use changed after the categorical governors were removed from the dataset. Namely, in the target study, with all governors, Seville used the subjunctive more often than the other two regions, and Quito and Mérida used the subjunctive at a quite similar rate. Whereas with only variable governors, Mérida was the group that used the subjunctive more often, followed by Seville, and lastly, by Quito (see Table 16). As previously mentioned, in the present investigation, Seville used the subjunctive most often when all governors were considered, and Barcelona exhibited the highest rate of subjunctive when only the variable governors were analyzed.

Table 16

Frequency of Subjunctive Use With Governors Across Regions

Mood use	The Current Study			Gudmestad (2021)		
	Rosario	Barcelona	Seville	Quito	Mérida	Seville
All governors	62.83	66.49	**69.83**	63.30	64.70	**68.10**
Variable governors	59.69	**68.55**	53.25	52.10	**64.20**	58.00

Turning to previous investigations, it is important to mention that I am making comparisons across studies, while acknowledging that each of them has focused on a different inventory of governors. Taking this into account, all studies have reported mood variation (between subjunctive and indicative) with governors across regions. A distinction may be established, though, between the studies that showed greater and those that showed lesser regional variation in the frequency of subjunctive use. Among the former, Schwenter and Hoff (2020) found great variation of mood use between Spain and two Latin American countries (Argentina and Mexico), with the Latin American countries exhibiting higher subjunctive use than Spain. Second, Dunlap (2006) showed that the use of the subjunctive was greatly favored in Spain and the use of indicative was preferred in Mexico. Third, García (2011) reported that Argentina and Cuba highly favored the subjunctive, while Peru and Venezuela highly disfavored it. Within these prior studies, however, there were some regions that exhibited a more uniform alternation between subjunctive and indicative. This was the case in Dunlap (2006) with Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Peru, and Venezuela and in García (2011) with Spain and Mexico. With respect to studies that found a lower degree of regional variation, Gallego and Alonso-Marks (2014a), for example, found that with certain expressions, Toledo seemed to show higher acceptability of the subjunctive than Rosario, whose participants accepted both moods. In brief, regional variation in the frequency of subjunctive use has been found to be greater in certain investigations than others. Thus, collectively, research on mood use in Spanish points to the existence of regional variation in the frequency of use of verbal moods.

Sociolinguistic Factors Related to Mood Use

The third research question refers to the examination of the sociolinguistic factors in relation to mood use across the regions of residence under investigation. With respect to the variable semantic category, the current study indicated a hierarchy of subjunctive use that was the same for all three regions. The highest rate of subjunctive use was produced with the category of volition, followed by comment, uncertainty, temporality and, lastly, by assertion. It is important to note that the category of uncertainty was the one that displayed the most mood variation in all regions, with rates of subjunctive and indicative use closer to 50 percent for each region. Additionally, the semantic category of temporality was the one that evidenced the greatest contrast of rates of subjunctive use among regions (Rosario: 15.15%, Seville: 44.09%, Barcelona: 63.68%). These findings provide evidence to support the observation that semantic categories are connected to variable mood use, as each category may favor different rates of subjunctive and indicative use.

Concerning the target study's findings for semantic category, they are similar to the current investigation, as they reported this variable to be connected to mood use in all regions. Through statistical analysis for each region, Gudmestad (2021) demonstrated a similar hierarchy of subjunctive use to the one observed in the current study—in an ascending order for all regions: assertion, temporality, uncertainty, comment, and volition.

Moreover, there is common ground between results in previous studies and the current one, as they present evidence that this linguistic variable is important for understanding variable mood use. My study mirrors some of Silva-Corvalán's (1994) findings for the category of assertion, which exhibited higher rates of indicative mood use, and the category of volition, which showed higher rates of subjunctive use. There is also consistency of findings between Gudmestad (2010, 2012) and the current study, as she reported a hierarchy of subjunctive use for the semantic categories in the same decreasing order (volition, comment, uncertainty, temporality, and assertion). There is a slight difference between the above-mentioned research and the current study, on the one hand, and Studerus (1995) on the other hand. Studerus, while finding variable mood use in all contexts of the semantic categories under investigation, found more alternation of mood use in the category of assertion than other studies, which exhibited a high preference for indicative mood with this category. Despite this, there is a commonality among the whole body of research, which is the connection that exists between the variable of semantic category and mood use.

Looking at the linguistic variable of individual governors, I examined the range of subjunctive use with governors in each region with the aim of exploring the relation between this variable and mood use across the regions of residence. This analysis revealed that some governors differentiated more than others in their use of subjunctive. As an illustration, *después de que* 'after' had the widest range of subjunctive use across regions (67.52%). In contrast, *estar seguro de que* 'to be sure that', with the narrowest range of subjunctive use (3.02%), represents the most uniform subjunctive use across the three regions. In addition, I examined the governors that exhibited variable mood use across the three regions, grouped according to their semantic categories, by comparing their frequencies. I found that, for the three regions, the governors of volition, most of the governors of comment, and certain governors of temporality (*hasta que* 'until', t*an pronto como* 'as soon as' and e*n cuanto* 'as soon as') exhibited a high rate of subjunctive use. In contrast, the rest of the governors of temporality showed lower subjunctive rates, and the governors of uncertainty showed varied rates of subjunctive use. In particular, *dudar que* 'to doubt that' and *no creer que* 'to not believe that' exhibited higher rates of subjunctive in all regions, whereas *tal vez* 'perhaps' and *no pensar que* 'to not think that' showed lower rates of subjunctive in Rosario in comparison with Barcelona and Seville. Lastly, governors of assertion showed very low rates of subjunctive. In brief, individual governors appeared to be a source of variability in mood use, as they presented diverse frequencies of subjunctive and indicative use.

With reference to the target study's findings on individual governors, there are two points in common with the current study. First, both studies considered individual governors in connection with semantic categories. Second, categorical and variable use with governors for the three regions in the target study exhibited different patterns of use with each governor among the regions, as is the case in the current study.

With respect to previous investigations in relation to individual governors across regions, all of them found this factor to be related to variable mood use across regions. Dunlap (2006), García (2011), Schwenter and Hoff (2020) and Gallego and Alonso-Marks (2012a) found differences of mood use with governors across regions, which is in line with the current and target investigations.

Concerning the linguistic variable of time reference in the current study, it exhibited different rates of mood use with each of its categories (future-, present-, and past-time) across regions and within each region. First, the highest rates of subjunctive use were produced with the future-time in Barcelona and the present- time in Rosario. In Seville, in contrast, higher rates of subjunctive appeared in both the past- and present-time contexts. Second, I compared the ranges of subjunctive use within each time reference category for each region, which revealed that Rosario presented the widest range among time reference categories, whereas Seville was the region that presented the least difference among the time reference categories. Therefore, I found that time reference manifested itself in a different manner with verbal moods across the regions as well as within regions, which suggests that this factor is important for understanding variable mood use.

Regarding the target investigation, the findings for time reference correspond to the current study's findings in that each region exhibited different patterns of use with respect to this variable. In Gudmestad (2021), subjunctive use was higher in present-time contexts in Quito, as it was for Rosario in the current study; whereas subjunctive was higher in future-time contexts in Mérida, as it was for Barcelona in the current study. Furthermore, statistical analysis in Gudmestad (2021) revealed that time reference was not significant in Seville. This relates to the results for Seville in the present study, as this region showed the smallest range of mood use with this variable, meaning that future-, present-, and past time were more similar to each other in comparison to the other two regions. These results suggest that time reference may not be important for the Seville participants in the current study, similar to those in the target study.

In regard to other studies' results on time reference, they showed evidence of this linguistic variable being connected to variable mood use. Gudmestad (2010, 2012), Studerus (1995), and Yelin and Czerwionka (2017) reported that future-time reference favored the use of the subjunctive, while past-time reference favored the use of indicative. Like these findings, in the current study, future-time reference appeared to be linked to subjunctive use in the Barcelona region. However, different trends were observed among the Seville and Rosario groups.

Turning to the extralinguistic variable of gender, in the current study, findings suggest that this variable may be related to mood use across the regions. A first comparison of overall mood use with variable governors between women and men in the whole dataset indicated that both women and men alike used the subjunctive more often than the indicative. However, by analyzing mood use with gender across regions, the comparison of subjunctive use between genders pointed to possible differences. Namely, in Rosario and Barcelona, men used the subjunctive slightly more than women, whereas in Seville women used the subjunctive slightly more than men. The differences are not dramatic but appear to be slightly greater in Barcelona (*range* = 4%) compared to Rosario (*range* = 2.53%) and Seville (*range* = 2.89%). Considering the analysis in each region, it appears that gender may be related to mood use to a larger extent in Barcelona. Whether this difference is indeed important needs to be confirmed with significance testing.

Referring to the target study, gender was not a significant predictor of mood use in any of the three regions under investigation. Taking this into account, there is a possibility that both, target and current findings are similar, as the differences found with gender in my study were small.

As for prior investigations' results with the variable of gender, they are compatible with the current study in terms of having found slight differences in mood use by men and women. Gallego and Alonso-Marks's (2014a) statistical analysis of gender per region (Toledo and Rosario) suggested that this variable was important in Toledo only, where men favored the use of indicative. However, their findings were tempered when they analyzed this variable along with the variable of age, which revealed that it was only older men in Toledo who favored the use of indicative. In another study, Waltermire (2017), who also studied gender combined with another variable, in this case, education, found that highly educated men used the subjunctive more than less educated women. Therefore, prior research has suggested that gender interacts with other social factors. In order to better understand possible gender differences in the current study and how gender may interact with other social variables, larger participant pools in each region are needed.

In connection with the final extralinguistic variable of individual participants, there was clear evidence of variation in the rate of mood use across participants in each region. When observing the individuals who produced the subjunctive most and least often, the highest subjunctive user was in Barcelona. Barcelona was also the region where individual participants used subjunctive mood most often than the other regions. Likewise, the participant who used the subjunctive least often was in Seville, which was also the region where the subjunctive was produced least often. Further, the ranges of subjunctive use revealed that Rosario exhibited the widest range of subjunctive use by individual participants (40%), close to Barcelona (39.77%), while Seville showed a narrower range of subjunctive use (25.18%). These observations indicate that this extralinguistic variable is related to mood use as individual participants exhibited differences in mood use across the regions.

Regarding the target study, Gudmestad (2021) did not provide details on patterns of use. Instead, she included participants as a random effect in the regression analyses as means of accounting for individual variability. Thus, no direct comparisons between the target and replication studies can be made.

With reference to other research, Gudmestad's (2012) findings (focused on individual participants in relation to governors, not on geographical regions) correspond to the current study's findings in that they showed evidence of variation in the rate of mood use across individual participants. Like the current study, she found that the individual participants produced different rates of subjunctive within a specific set of governors. This demonstrates evidence of the relationship existing between individual variation and mood use.

To summarize, in light of the comparisons of categorical and variable mood use across Rosario, Argentina; Barcelona, Spain; and Seville, Spain, the comparisons of the frequency of use of verbal moods, and the analysis of sociolinguistic factors in relation to mood use across the three regions, the current study offers evidence of regional variation. The comparison with the target investigation's findings as well as with other investigations' results enables this research to take a step forward towards expanding knowledge on variable mood use in Spanish. Exploring mood use in different regions allowed us to confirm the importance of geographical region in its connection to mood use. Likewise, this conceptual replication found various similarities to Gudmestad (2021), which strengthens the confirmatory power of some of the target study's findings. In this vein, the current study is unique because replication studies are an uncommon endeavor in variationist sociolinguistics. Regarding current and target studies' findings on regional variation, it is recalled that the target study states that variation found in mood use across regions may indicate the existence of distinct grammars or different stages of language change (Gudmestad, 2021, p. 387). Following from this, the results in the current study may indicate that the participant groups may have divergent grammars or might find themselves at different phases of the process of language change.

Conclusion

The current study has explored variable mood use in three different Spanish-speaking regions: Rosario, Argentina; Barcelona, Spain; and Seville, Spain. This exploration has been conducted in the form of a conceptual replication of an original study carried out by Gudmestad (2021), who analyzed variable mood use in Quito, Ecuador; Mérida, Mexico; and Seville, Spain. Through an analysis of frequency of use of verbal moods and of a range of sociolinguistic factors, this work has found evidence of variation in mood use across geographical regions. As such, the present work adds to the body of knowledge about mood use in Spanish in its relationship to regional variation.

The present investigation has identified various rates of mood use among the regions. In particular, considering the dataset with only variable governors, the Barcelona group showed the highest rate of subjunctive use, followed by Rosario and then by Seville. The target investigation (Gudmestad, 2021) similarly found different rates of mood use across the participant groups: for the dataset with only variable governors, Mérida was the region with the most subjunctive use, followed by Seville and lastly, by Quito. In general, both the current and target studies found slightly different rates of subjunctive and indicative mood use across the set of regions under each investigation, which pointed to evidence of regional variation in the frequency of use of verbal moods.

With respect to the linguistic factors, this investigation has demonstrated that the variable of individual governors is connected to mood use across regions. Specifically, individual governors in the current study exhibited distinct frequencies of subjunctive and indicative use across regions. This use of verbal moods with governors was variable across the regions for the most part (i.e., for all three regions, 11 governors were variable, eight were categorical, and the remaining 11 governors showed differing patterns across regions). In comparison, the target investigation (Gudmestad, 2021) also found variable mood use with just over a third of the governors for all three regions (12 governors were variable, and the remaining 18 exhibited differing patterns across regions). In this regard, one of the differences between both studies that is worthy of mention was that categorical mood use with governors for all three regions was not revealed in the target study, whereas this consistent categorical use (for the subjunctive and indicative with eight governors) for all three regions was found in the current study. When centered on the set of 19 governors in common between studies, most of the governors (n = 15) showed differences across regions. Moreover, when focused on Seville, the region in common between studies, more than half of the individual governors exhibited differences between studies in terms of categorical and variable use of verbal moods. All in all, what is important to highlight is that divergent patterns in categorical and variable mood use were revealed among individual governors across regions in both investigations, which strengthens the key role that governors play in understanding variable mood use in Spanish. This also signaled that the envelopes of variation for mood use may be diverse across regions because the circumscription of the variable context appears to be different.

The differences in mood use across regions may also be related to the role of the other linguistic factors included in the analysis—semantic category and time reference. Regarding semantic category, the present study has shown that this variable is related to mood use as it revealed different rates of subjunctive and indicative use across regions. Overall, this factor pointed to a hierarchy of subjunctive use that manifested itself in the same order in each region, with the category of volition displaying the highest rate of subjunctive and the category of assertion showing the lowest rate of subjunctive in all regions. These observations strengthen the target study (Gudmestad, 2021) findings, which also found a hierarchy of subjunctive use in the same order (assertion, temporality, uncertainty, comment, and volition) in all three regions. With respect to time reference, the current study found that this variable appears to be related to mood use as it exhibited differing rates of subjunctive and indicative mood use with each category (future-, present- and past time) across regions and within each region. One point of comparison between the two studies pertains to Seville. In both investigations, Seville, compared to the other regions, exhibited patterns of mood use that differed less across the three time references. In sum, both the current and target studies, found varying frequencies of subjunctive and indicative use with semantic category and time reference across regions, which demonstrated regional variation of mood with these linguistic variables.

Concerning the examination of extralinguistic factors—gender, individual participants and geographical regions—the present work has found evidence that points to a possible relationship between these variables and mood use. Regarding gender, slight differences across regions were observed, as Rosario and Barcelona showed slightly more use of the subjunctive by women, whereas Seville exhibited slightly more use of the subjunctive by men. In contrast, Gudmestad (2021) found that this variable was not a significant predictor of mood use in any of the regions. There is a possibility, though, that both study findings are related as the differences in my investigation across the regions were slight. With reference to individual participants residing in each region, the present study demonstrated variation in the frequency of mood use among participants across regions. Namely, the ranges of subjunctive use among individual participants were different in each region, with Rosario exhibiting the highest range of subjunctive use (i.e., the greatest difference between the participants who used the subjunctive the most and least often). The results for Barcelona were similar to those for Rosario, and Seville showed the narrowest range among subjunctive users. Finally, geographical region, throughout the different components of the analysis appeared to be a factor connected to variable use of verbal moods. This reinforced the target study's findings on the presence of regional variation. The fact that distinct patterns in categorical and variable mood use were revealed with the linguistic and extralinguistic variables under investigation across regions in both investigations seems to suggest that speakers residing in different regions may have distinct grammars. In other words, the different patterns of variable use observed across regions suggest that the internal grammatical system that shapes mood use may differ geographically

Despite the current study's findings, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. One of them has to do with the means of data collection. The use of an internet software for distributing the surveys appeared as an advantage to deal with collecting data in different geographical regions quickly and without the researcher incurring travel expenses. While these two goals were met, other aspects of this means of collecting data were difficult. For example, the range of education levels of the participants was limited. Because the task required access to the Internet to participate, the population sample belonged to socio-economic groups that could afford this kind of service, which in general is connected to certain levels of education. Another limiting aspect of the study was the fact that inferential statistics were not employed in the analysis, which not only limited the observations that could be gleaned from the data but also constituted a difference with the target study.

In view of the above, my suggestions for future research are connected to the social factors of education level, age, and gender, all of which are worthy of further investigation. It is important to find a means of data collection that can include more diverse levels of education, so that the role of this variable in its relationship with mood use can be thoroughly analyzed.

Secondly, studying the variable of age through correlation tests or in a regression would be crucial to add knowledge on mood use within the process of language change. Thirdly, continuing to study gender in connection with mood use would add confirmatory testing to prior research’s mixed results. Finally, conducting new cross-dialectal studies in the regions that have been analyzed are important for reinforcing existing findings, and studying other Spanish speaking regions are necessary to expand knowledge on regional variation.

References

Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. (2010). El verbo (III), El modo. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española. Manual*. Editorial Planeta Mexicana.

Bove, K., & Limerick, P. (2021). Mood alternation in Mexican Spanish in Georgia. *Spanish in Context*, *20*(1), 76-95.

Blake, R. (1983). Mood selection among Spanish-speaking children: Ages 4 to 12. *The Bilingual Review*, *10*(1), 21-32.

Deshors, S., & Waltermire, M. (2019). The indicative vs. subjunctive alternation with expressions of possibility in Spanish. A multifactorial analysis. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *24*(1), 67-97.

Dunlap, C. (2006). Dialectal variation in mood choice in Spanish journalistic prose. *Language Variation and Change*, *6*, 35-53.

Gallego, M. & Alonso-Marks, E. (2014a). Subjunctive use variation among monolingual native speakers of Spanish: A cross dialectal analysis. *Spanish in Context*, *11*(3), 357-380.

Gallego, M. & Alonso-Marks, E. (2014b). Degrees of subjunctive vitality among monolingual speakers of Peninsular and Argentinian Spanish. *Borealis. International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, *3*(2), 95-194.

García, C. (2011). Distinguishing two 'synonyms': A variationist analysis of *quizá* and *quizás* in six Spanish dialects. In J. Michnowicz & R. Dodsworth (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 5th workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics* (pp.103-112). Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Gudmestad, A. (2010). Moving beyond the sentence-level analysis in the study of variable mood in Spanish. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, *29*(1), 25-51.

Gudmestad, A. (2012). Individual lexical triggers and variable mood use in Spanish. *International Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest*, *31*(2), 3-27.

Gudmestad, A. (2021). A cross-dialectal analysis of variable mood use in Spanish. In M. Diaz-Campos (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of variationist approaches to Spanish.* (pp. 375-389). Routledge.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lavandera, B. (1978). Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop? *Language in Society*, *7*, 171-182.

Mackey, A. (2012). Why (or why not), when, and how to replicate research. In G. Porte (Ed.), *Replication research in applied linguistics* (pp. 21-46). Cambridge Applied Linguistics.

Poplack, S., Torres Cacoullos, R., Dion, N., de Andrade Berlinck, R., Digesto, S., Lacasse, D., & Steuck, J. (2018). Variation and grammaticalization in Romance: A cross-linguistic study of the subjunctive. In W. Ayres-Bennet & J. Carruthers (Eds.), *Manuals in linguistics: Romance sociolinguistics* (pp. 217-252). De Gruyter.

Porte G., & McManus K. (2019). *Doing replication research in applied linguistics*. Routledge.

Sankoff, D. (1988). Sociolinguistic and syntactic variation. In F. J. Newmeyer (Ed.), *Language:The socio-cultural context* (pp. 140-161). Cambridge University Press.

Schwenter, S. (2011). Variationist approaches to Spanish morphosyntax: Internal and external factors. In M. Diaz-Campos (Ed.), *The handbook of Hispanic sociolinguistics* (pp.123-147). Blackwell.

Schwenter, S., & Hoff, M. (2020). Cross-dialectal productivity of the Spanish subjunctive in nominal clause complements. In S. Sessarego, J. J. Colomina-Almiñana, & A. Rodríguez-Riccelli (Eds.), *Variation and evolution: Aspects of language contact and contrast across the Spanish-speaking world* (pp. 11-31). John Benjamins.

Silva Corvalán, C. (1985). Modality and semantic change. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Historical semantics-Historical word-formation*, (pp. 547-572). De Gruyter Mouton.

Silva Corvalán, C. (1994). The gradual loss of mood distinctions in Los Angeles Spanish. *Language Variation and Change, 6*, 255-272.

Silvia-Corvalán, C. (2001). *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*. Georgetown University Press.

Studerus, L. (1995) Mood variability in border Spanish. Bilingual Review, *20*(2), 99-113.

Tagliamonte, S. (2006). *Analyzing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge University Press.

Tagliamonte, S. (2012). *Variationist sociolinguistics: Change, observation, interpretation,* Wiley-Blackwell.

Torres Cacoullos, R., LaCasse, D., Johns, M., & De La Rosa Yacomelo, J. (2017). El subjuntivo: Hacia la rutinización. *Moenia 23*, 73-94.

Walker, J. A. (2010). *Variation in linguistic systems.* Routledge.

Waltemire, M. (2014). The social conditioning of mood variation in the Spanish of Albuquerque, New Mexico. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, *8*(1), 111-137.

Waltermire, M. (2017). Mood variation after expressions of uncertainty in Spanish. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, *10*(2), 349-372.

Yelin, B., & Czerwionka, L. (2017). *Capaz* and *quizás* in Argentine Spanish: Epistemic adverbs with mood variability. *Hispania*, *100(1)*, 30-46.

Appendix A: Background Questionnaire in English

Please, complete the following questions:

1- Birth year: ________________

2- Birthplace (city, country): ____

3- For how many years have you lived in your current city? __________________________

4- Have you lived in other places? Yes / No

4.1- If your answer is “Yes”: which one/ones?

____

4.2- For how many months/years have you lived in the mentioned places?

Place 1: ____________________________________

Place 2: ____________________________________

Place 3: ____________________________________

5- Gender: ____

6- Which language/s was/were spoken in your home/family environment in your childhood?

____

7- Which language/s do you speak in your family environment during adulthood?

____

8- Which languages do you currently speak with your friends?

____

9- Which languages do you currently speak with your coworkers/classmates?

____

10- Do you know or have you had any experiences with other language/s? If so, which one/s?

____

11- Educational background:

Elementary school (complete/incomplete)

Middle school (complete/incomplete)

High school (incomplete/complete)

Post-secondary school (complete/incomplete)

Appendix B: Background Questionnaire in Spanish (for Argentina)

Por favor, completá las siguientes preguntas:

1- Año de nacimiento: _______________

2- Lugar de nacimiento (ciudad y país): ____

3- ¿Cuántos meses/años has vivido en tu ciudad actual? ___________________________

4- ¿Viviste en otros lugares? Si / No

4.1- Si tu respuesta es "sí": ¿cuál/cuáles?

____

4.2- ¿Por cuántos meses/años has vivido en el/los lugares mencionados?

____

Lugar 1 __________________

Lugar 2 __________________

Lugar 3 __________________

5- Género: ____

6- ¿Qué idioma/s se hablaba en tu hogar/entorno familiar en tu niñez?

____

7- ¿Qué idiomas hablás en tu entorno familiar en la adultez?

____

8- ¿Qué idiomas hablás con tus amistades?

____

9- ¿Qué idiomas hablás con tus compañeros de trabajo/de clase?

____

10- ¿Conocés otros idiomas, o has tenido alguna experiencia con algún otro idioma?

11- Formación educativa (marca la que corresponda):

Educación primaria (incompleta / completa)

Educación secundaria (incompleta / completa)

Educación superior terciaria (incompleta / completa)

Educación superior universitaria (incompleta/completa)

Appendix C: Background Questionnaire in Spanish (for Spain)

Por favor, completa las siguientes preguntas:

1- Año de nacimiento: _______________

2- Lugar de nacimiento (ciudad y país): ____

3- ¿Cuántos meses/años has vivido en tu ciudad actual? ___________________________

4- ¿Has vivido en otros lugares? Si / No

4.1- Si tu respuesta es “sí”: ¿cuál/cuáles?
____

4.2- ¿Por cuántos meses/años has vivido en el/los lugares mencionados?
____

Lugar 1 __________________

Lugar 2 __________________

Lugar 3 __________________

5- Género: ____

6- ¿Qué idioma/s se hablaba en tu hogar/entorno familiar en tu niñez?
____

7- ¿Qué idiomas hablas en tu entorno familiar en la adultez?
____

8- ¿Qué idiomas hablas con tus amistades?
____

9- ¿Qué idiomas hablas con tus compañeros de trabajo/de clase?
____

10- ¿Conoces otros idiomas, o has tenido alguna experiencia con algún otro idioma?
____

11- Formación educativa (marca la que corresponda):

Educación primaria (incompleta/completa)

Educación secundaria obligatoria (incompleta/completa)

Bachillerato (incompleta/completa)

Formación profesional de grado medio (incompleta/completa)

Formación universitaria (incompleta/completa)

Appendix D: Data Collection Task in English

The following story is about three friends, Pablo, Marina and Tomás, who, one evening, get together in a bar to celebrate the start of a new year. A conversation takes place among them, which is presented in 30 segments. Each segment has an introductory sentence and an initial phrase below to be completed by following the thread of the story.

For example:

Tomas wishes to change some eating and drinking habits to live a healthy life. He says:

"I need ____."

A possible answer: "*… to pay more attention to the quality of my food and drink less alcohol from now on."*

***

1. With some pizzas and drinks recently served, the friends start talking about the concept of health triggered by Tomas' comment (above) regarding food. Marina agrees with the relationship between good food habits and good health. She says:

   "I believe that ____."

2. Pablo listens to his friends, and he does not doubt about the importance of physical exercise. So, he says:

   "It is clear that ____."

3. Tomas thinks of something even more important for health: the wellbeing that results from acceptance of oneself and love from those around us. Thus, he adds:

   "I don't believe that ____."

4. Marina reflects on the importance of self-accepting. So, she says:

   "I doubt that ____."

5. Pablo likes Tomas's and Marina's ideas. For him, institutions tend to focus on illnesses, rather than teaching people how to achieve and maintain good health. He adds:

   "It is a pity that ____."

6. While the group of friends enjoy the background music, Marina looks at the color of the beverage through the glass, and encouraged by the start of the new year, focuses her wishes on the future at the global level, centered in a fairer and less violent world. She says:

   "I wish ____."

7. Pablo, on the contrary, does not have hopes of a better world in the following years. He says:

   "I am not sure that ____."

8. For Tomas, being as idealist as Marina, change in people's consciences will occur in a near future. Raising his glass, he says:

   "I hope that ____."

9. Pablo likes what his friends say, but he is still hopeless. In an effort, he raises his glass and expresses his wishes for the future:

   "It is important that ____."

10. The waiter gets near the table, and everybody orders coffee and cream. With the cup of coffee in his hand, Pablo asks Marina if she has any employment goal for the year that has just started. Marina has been promised a promotion around the middle of the year in the company where she works. Thinking of how her professional life will be some months ahead, she says:

    "It is possible that ____."

11. Pablo feels happy about Marina's job possibilities in the second half of the year and says:

    "How good that ____."

12. Marina is happy with the things she will be able to do when her income increases. Thinking of remodeling her house, says:

    "I will hire an architect to add more room to my house as soon as

    ____."

13. Marina asks Tomas about his objectives for this new year in relation to his job. He is very satisfied, except for the salary. That is why he is thinking of getting some extra money by offering his services through the internet in the following months. He says:

    "I am going to get local clients, and later on, international clients once

    ____."

14. Pablo is listening in silence. He is not satisfied with his job, but he cannot come up with any objective for the future. At present, he does wish to work less hours per day. Reflecting about his current situation, he says:

    "I want that____."

15. Tomas recommends Pablo to take it easy. He says:

    "Staying calm and valuing your work and effort is a good idea, until

    ____."

16. Pablo listens to Tomas and concentrates on the daily and constant mistreatment from his boss. So, he expresses: "Getting relaxed is very difficult, and even more, to feel self-esteem while ____."

17. For Mariana, what may help is taking a more distant view, such as the practice of observing oneself from a balcony. Thus, she adds:

"It is better that ____."

18. Pablo keeps reflecting, and suddenly, a new glow appears in his look. He imagines himself doing an activity further on. Thinking of the future with enthusiasm, he says:

"I am sure that ____."

19. Marina does not doubt about Pablo's capacity to improve his situation in the future. She tells him: "I think that ____."

The group of friends feel so well together that they do not want to leave yet, so they order more coffee. Then, Marina asks: which experience did stand out in your life last year?

20. Tomás, who had a baby with his couple last year, says: "I felt very happy, and I have not stopped learning things after ____."

21. Tomas goes on meditating regarding what he felt. His daughter's birth was useful to value essential things in life. So, he adds:

"I realized that ____."

22. The best of this year for Pablo was that Giulia, his girlfriend, finally decided to go to live with him. He says:

"I liked that ____."

23. Tomas is glad for the change his friend made last year; living together with his girlfriend seems to have made him order his priorities. Before that, he seemed aimless. So, he expresses:

"It was advisable that ____."

24. For Marina, Pablo was ready to face such a project. She says:

"It was obvious that ____."

25. Pablo nods. After a few days that Giulia was living with him, he wondered why they had not made up their minds before.

“I wished that ____.”

26. “His girlfriend did not wish to live as a couple a time ago”, Tomas thinks. Remembering Giulia’s stance in the past regarding the possibility of living in union with someone, he says: “Perhaps ____.”

27. Pablo agrees with Tomas. Remembering some of his girlfriend’s behaviors two years ago, he adds: “She appeared very insecure regarding how to balance the time for herself and for the other when ____.”

28. For Mariana, the whole year was wonderful. The only bad thing was what happened in the world. So, she says:

“It annoyed me that ____.”

29. Changing topics abruptly, Pablo askes what their opinions are with respect to the nominations for President. Tomas is not willing to talk about that just then, that is why he says: “I prefer that ____.”

30. The three friends realize that they are the only ones left in the bar. They pay the bill and say goodbye to the waiter. Marina had a better time than she had imagined. While they are leaving the bar, she says:

“I did not think that ____.”

Appendix E: Data Collection Task in Spanish

La historia siguiente trata de tres amigos, Pablo, Marina y Tomás, quienes se reúnen una tarde en un bar para festejar el comienzo del año. Se desarrolla una conversación, que se presenta en 30 segmentos. Cada segmento tiene una oración introductoria, y debajo, una frase inicial para completar siguiendo el hilo de la conversación.

Por ejemplo:

Tomás desea cambiar algunos hábitos de comida y bebida para llevar una vida más saludable.

Dice: Necesito…____.”

Una respuesta posible: *"…prestar más atención a la calidad de mis comidas y tomar menos alcohol de ahora en adelante."*

***

1. Con unas pizzas y bebidas recién servidas, los amigos comienzan a charlar sobre el concepto de salud que se disparó con el comentario de Tomás sobre las comidas. Marina está de acuerdo con la relación entre los hábitos de consumo y una buena salud. Dice:

   "Creo que ____."
2. Pablo escucha lo que dicen sus amigos y no duda de la importancia de hacer ejercicio físico. Dice: "Está claro que ____."
3. Tomás piensa en algo aún más importante para la salud: el bienestar anímico que resulta de la aceptación de uno mismo y el amor de los que nos rodean. Entonces, agrega:
   "No creo que ____."
4. Marina reflexiona sobre la importancia de aceptarse a uno mismo. Entonces, dice:

   "Dudo que ____."

5. A Pablo le gustan las ideas de Tomás y Marina. Para él, las instituciones suelen centrarse mucho en la enfermedad, en vez de enseñar a la gente cómo lograr y conservar una buena salud. Añade:

   “Es una lástima que ____.”

6. Los amigos disfrutan de la música de fondo. Marina mira el color de la bebida a través del vidrio de su copa y, estimulada por el comienzo de un nuevo año, se concentra en sus deseos sobre el futuro a nivel global, centrados en un mundo más justo y menos violento. Dice:

   “Ojalá que ____.”

7. Pablo, por el contrario, no tiene esperanzas de un mundo mejor en los próximos años. Dice:

   No estoy seguro de que ____.”

8. Para Tomás, tan idealista como Marina, el cambio en las conciencias de las personas ocurrirá en un futuro cercano. Mientras levanta su copa, dice:

   “Espero que ____.”

9. A Pablo le encanta lo que dicen sus amigos, pero sigue sin esperanzas. En un esfuerzo, levanta su copa y expresa su deseo para el futuro:

   “Es importante que ____.”

10. El camarero se acerca y todos piden café con crema. Con la taza de café en la mano, Pablo le pregunta a Marina si se ha propuesto algún objetivo laboral para el transcurso del año que acaba de comenzar. A Marina le han prometido una promoción hacia la mitad del año en la compañía donde trabaja. Pensando en cómo será su vida profesional en su nuevo puesto unos meses más tarde, dice:

    “Es posible que ____.”

11. Pablo se siente feliz por las posibilidades laborales de Marina hacia la segunda mitad del año y le dice:

"Qué bueno que ____."

12. Marina se alegra con las cosas que podrá hacer al aumentar sus ingresos. Pensando en remodelar su vivienda, dice:

"Voy a contratar a un arquitecto para ampliar los ambientes de mi casa tan pronto como ____."

13. Marina le pregunta a Tomás sobre sus objetivos para el transcurso del nuevo año en lo laboral. Él está muy conforme, excepto por el monto salarial. Por eso está pensando en obtener un ingreso extra en los próximos meses, ofreciendo sus servicios por internet. Dice:

"Voy a conseguir clientes a nivel local y luego a nivel internacional en cuanto ____."

14. Pablo está en silencio. No está conforme con su trabajo, pero no se le ocurre ningún objetivo para el futuro. En el presente, eso sí, desea trabajar menos horas al día. Reflexionando sobre su situación actual, dice:

"Quiero que ____."

15. Tomás le recomienda a Pablo tomarse su situación actual con tranquilidad. Le dice:

"Es una buena idea mantener la calma y valorar tu esfuerzo y tu trabajo, hasta que ____."

16. Pablo lo escucha a Tomás y se concentra en el maltrato diario y constante de su jefe. Entonces expresa:

"Es muy difícil relajarme, y más aún, sentirme valorado mientras ____."

17. Para Marina, lo que puede ayudar es una mirada desde una perspectiva más distante, como la práctica de observarse a sí mismo desde un balcón. Entonces, añade:

    "Es mejor que ____."

18. Pablo se queda reflexionando y de pronto un nuevo brillo aparece en su mirada. Se imagina haciendo otra actividad más adelante. Pensando en el futuro con entusiasmo, dice:

    "Estoy seguro de que ____."

19. Marina no duda de la capacidad de Pablo para mejorar su situación en el futuro. Le dice:

    "Pienso que____."

    Los amigos se sienten tan bien juntos que no quieren irse todavía, así que se piden una ronda más de café. Luego, Marina les pregunta: ¿Y qué experiencia destacan del año pasado?

20. Tomás, quien tuvo un bebé con su pareja el año pasado, dice:

    "Me sentí muy feliz y no he parado de aprender cosas nuevas después de que

    ____."

21. Tomás sigue meditando sobre lo que sintió. El nacimiento de su hija le sirvió para valorar las cosas esenciales de la vida. Entonces, añade:

    "Me di cuenta de que ____."

22. Lo mejor del año anterior para Pablo fue que Giulia, su novia, finalmente decidió irse a vivir con él. Dice:

    "Me gustó mucho que ____."

23. Tomás se alegra por el cambio que su amigo hizo el año anterior; la convivencia parece haberle hecho ordenar sus prioridades, antes se lo veía como sin rumbo. Por lo tanto, expresa:

    "Era aconsejable que ____."

24. Para Marina, Pablo ya estaba listo para encarar un proyecto de convivencia. Dice:

“Era obvio que ____.”

25. Pablo asiente con la cabeza. A los pocos días que Giulia estaba conviviendo con él, se preguntó por qué no se habían decidido antes.

“Deseé que ____.”

26. “Su novia no tenía deseos de vivir en pareja un tiempo atrás”, cree Tomás. Recordando la postura de Giulia en el pasado sobre la posibilidad de convivir, dice:

“Tal vez ____.”

27. Pablo concuerda con Tomás. Recordando algunos comportamientos de su novia dos años atrás, agrega: “Ella se mostraba muy insegura sobre cómo equilibrar los tiempos propios y los compartidos cuando ____.”

28. Para Marina, todo el año anterior fue maravilloso. Lo único malo para ella fue lo que sucedió en el mundo. Entonces, dice:

“Me molestó que ____.”

29. Cambiando de tema abruptamente, Pablo pregunta qué opinan sobre las nuevas candidaturas para presidente. Tomás no tiene ganas de hablar de eso justo en ese momento, por eso dice:

“Prefiero que ____.”

30. Los tres amigos se dan cuenta de que se han quedado solos en el bar. Pagan la cuenta y saludan al camarero. Marina lo pasó mucho mejor de lo que había imaginado. Mientras salen, dice:

“No pensé que____.”

Appendix F: Analysis of verb forms in relation to time reference

This appendix shows an analysis of the repertoire of verb forms that were produced by the participants in the task in relation to time reference. Tables A, B and C show an inventory of tense, mood, and aspect of verb forms according to time reference.

Table A

Frequency of TMA according to Time Reference: Rosario

TMA	Past		Present		Future		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Imperfect Indicative	77	22.13	-	-	-	-	77
Preterit Indicative	71	20.40	-	-	4	3.05	75
Present Indicative	8	2.30	44	25	11	8.40	63
Present Progr. Indicative	-	-	2	1.14	-	-	2
Conditional	13	3.74	-	-	3	2.29	16
Conditional Perfect	1	0.29	-	-	-	-	1
Morphol. Future Indicative	-	-	1	0.57	16	12.21	17
Periphr. Future Indicative	-	-	-	-	14	10.69	14
Imperfect Subjunctive	70	20.11	-	-	-	-	70
Imperfect Progr. Subjunctive	1	0.29	-	-	-	-	1
Present Perfect Subjunctive	18	5.17	-	-	3	2.29	21
Pluperfect Subjunctive	25	7.18	-	-	-	-	25
Present Subjunctive	62	17.82	129	73.30	78	59.54	269
Present Progr. Subjunctive	1	0.29	-	-	2	1.53	3
Periphr. Future Subjunctive	1	029	-	-	-	-	1
Total	348	100	176	100	131	100	655

Table B

Frequency of TMA according to Time Reference: Barcelona

TMA	Past		Present		Future		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Imperfect Indicative	42	16.60	-	-	-	-	42
Imperfect Progr. Indicative	1	0.40	-	-	-	-	1
Preterit Indicative	18	7.11	-	-	1	0.79	19

Table B (continued)

TMA	Past		Present		Future		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Present Perfect Indicative	8	3.16	-	-	-	-	8
Present Indicative	2	0.79	66	29.86	11	8.66	79
Conditional	12	4.74	1	0.45	5	3.94	18
Morphol. Future Indicative	1	0.40	-	-	14	11.02	15
Morphol. Future Perf. Indic.	1	0.40	-	-	-	-	1
Periphr. Future Indicative	-	-	1	0.45	2	1.57	3
Imperfect Subjunctive	127	50.20	1	0.4	1	0.79	129
Imperfect Progr. Subjunctive	2	0.79	-	-	-	-	2
Present Perfect Subjunctive	6	2.37	-	-	7	5.51	13
Pluperfect Subjunctive	20	7.91	-	-	-	-	20
Present Subjunctive	13	5.14	152	68.78	85	66.93	250
Periphr. Future Subjunctive	-	-	-	-	1	0.79	1
Total	253	100	221	100	127	100	601

Table C

Frequency of TMA according to Time Reference: Seville

TMA	Past		Present		Future		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Imperfect Indicative	63	30.14	-	-	-	-	63
Imperfect Progr. Indicative	1	0.48	-	-	-	-	1
Preterit Indicative	19	9.09	-	-	-	-	19
Present Perfect Indicative	3	1.44	1	0.81	-	-	4
Pluperfect Indicative	1	0.48	-	-	-	-	1
Present Indicative	6	2.87	42	33.87	7	11.29	55
Present Progr. Indicative	-	-	1	0.81	-	-	1
Conditional	-	-	6	4.84	1	1.61	12
Morphol. Future Indicative	-	-	5	4.03	19	30.65	24
Periphr. Future Indicative	-	-	2	1.61	4	6.45	6
Imperfect Subjunctive	94	44.98	-	-	-	-	94
Present Perfect Subjunctive	7	3.35	-	-	3	4.84	10
Pluperfect Subjunctive	7	3.35	-	-	-	-	7
Present Subjunctive	7	3.35	67	54.03	23	37.10	97
Present Progr. Subjuntive	1	0.48	-	-	1	1.61	2
Periphr. Future Subjunctive	-	-	-	-	4	6.45	4
Total	209	100	124	100	62	100	400