Periphrastic and morphological future forms in Bogotá Spanish: A preliminary sociolinguistic study of upper class speakers[1]

Dunia Catalina Méndez Vallejo
Indiana University

Abstract

The use of periphrastic (*voy a estudiar* 'I'm going to study') and morphological (*estudiaré* 'I will study') future forms has been widely studied in Spanish (Sedano, 1994; Almeida & Díaz, 1998; Aaron, 2006). In Colombian Spanish, however, only a few investigations have been conducted (Montes, 1962; Berschin, 1987; Orozco, 2005). Motivated by previous research, the present study describes the use of periphrastic and morphological future forms in a specific Colombian dialect (Bogotá Spanish), in two different types of corpora: an oral corpus from the 1990's (Samper-Padilla et al., 1998), and a written corpus of readers' opinions sections from five online Colombian newspapers. Given the limitations of the corpora, this investigation restricts its analysis to the production of future forms by upper-class speakers from Bogotá in order to examine the distribution of these forms in both oral and written data, and in relation to social and linguistic variables. A total of 352 cases were analyzed by the statistical program Goldvarb 2.0 (Rand & Sankoff, 1990), and both social and linguistic variables were included in the analysis. The results show that the periphrastic form is most frequently used in the oral data (79.2%), whereas the morphological form is substantially preferred in the written data (82.2%). Contrary to what has been found in previous investigations (Sedano, 1994; Orozco, 2005; Almeida & Díaz, 1998; Díaz & Almeida, 2000), the analysis suggests that both proximal and non-proximal future situations favor the use of the morphological form in oral data (.765 and .934, respectively), and disfavor it in written data (.140 and .474, respectively). A closer look at the distribution of the remaining cases of the periphrastic future in temporally unspecified situations in the oral corpus (95/114), indicates that 38 cases (40%) clearly show futurity, whereas the other 57 cases (60%) are used with some type of modality (speaker's predictions, speaker's actions in a hypothetical situation, or other hypothetical uses). Although the number of cases analyzed here is limited and further research is needed, the data suggest that the periphrastic future may be acquiring modal uses that have been exclusively associated with the morphological future (predictions, hypotheses, etc.).

0. Introduction

Morphological and periphrastic forms are often used to express futurity in Spanish. Although present simple forms in the indicative mood may also acquire this function, they are beyond the scope of the present study.

The morphological future and the periphrastic future may be used interchangeably, since they both indicate that the action takes place in a time posterior to the present. As illustrated below, in the case of the morphological future (1), the verb is assigned a suffix with future tense, person, and number specifications. That is, in the case of *trabajar* ('to work'), the morpheme assigned may mark first person singular (*-é*), second person singular (*-ás*), third person singular (*-á*), first person plural (*-emos*), second person plural (*-éis*), or third person plural (*-án*). As for the

[1] I am grateful to Dr. Julie Auger, Dr. Barbara Vance, Dr. César Félix-Brasdefer, Dr. Manuel Díaz-Campos, Scott Lamanna, and Feray Baskin for their comments on previous versions of this paper. Any shortcomings are entirely my own.

periphrastic future (2), the main verb remains in the infinitive form, as it is preceded by the verb *ir* ('to go') in present simple indicative, and the preposition *a* ('to'):

(1) *Trabajarán en el proyecto*
work-$_{3PL\text{-}FUT}$ in the project
'They **will** work on the project'

(2) *Van a trabajar en el proyecto*
go-$_{3PL\text{-}PRES}$ to work-$_{INF}$ in the project
'They **are going to work** on the project'

Although many studies have analyzed the historical, semantic and sociolinguistic factors that condition the use of these Spanish forms in written and oral data (Silva Corvalán & Terrell, 1989; Sedano, 1994; Almeida & Díaz, 1998; among others.), few have examined them in current Colombian Spanish. Given the need to further understand the use of these two future forms in this particular variety of Spanish, the present study attempts to discover the general distribution of the two forms in a specific dialect of Colombia (the factors that favor or disfavor the use of each form in contexts where either structure can be used), and to determine whether one form is more frequent in a particular language register (oral or written).

From the macrocorpus of the linguistic norm in the main Hispanic cities (Samper-Padilla et al., 1998), we extracted oral data comprised of fourteen interviews with upper class Bogotá speakers (7 females and 7 males). From five local newspapers available online we selected the readers' opinions sections to analyze the same phenomenon in written data. In order to determine how variation occurs between the two future forms, social and linguistic factors are statistically analyzed by means of the computer program Goldvarb 2.0 (Rand & Sankoff, 1990).

Taking into account the presumably prestigious character of the morphological future, we expect to find it more frequently used in written than in oral data. However, since the speakers from the oral corpus belong to a social class that has been exposed to high levels of formal instruction we do not expect the oral data to show a drastic preference toward the periphrastic form. In fact, since female speakers favored the occurrence of the morphological future in previous studies where this form was found to have a prestigious status (Almeida & Díaz, 1998; Díaz & Almeida, 2000), we expect it to also be favored by this kind of speaker in the present study. Furthermore, the specific structural and modal features of the two forms seem to determine the constraints on their use to express futurity (i.e. the morphological future tends to occur with uncertain situations that are temporally indefinite, whereas the periphrastic future tends to be used with certain situations that are temporally definite). As will be shown in the present study, the latter assumption may not be as definite as has been previously thought.

The present study is organized as follows: Section 1 discusses previous studies on future forms in English and French, and proceeds to outline other findings on Spanish. Section 2 illustrates the methodology and procedures used to analyze the data. Section 3 presents the results obtained, in terms of quantitative and qualitative analyses. Section 4 provides a discussion of the statistical results. Finally, section 5 includes conclusions, limitations of the study, and pathways for future research.

1. Previous studies

1.1. *Historic and semantic considerations*

The evolution of the future tense in Spanish constitutes a very interesting process of language change. As noted by Penny (2002), future Latin forms (CANTĀBŌ 'I will sing', TIMĒBO 'I will fear', VENDAM 'I will sell' and AUDIAM 'I will listen') do not have any descendents in any of the Romance languages, and were actually replaced by new forms in Vulgar Latin. According to Penny (2002), the reasons that justify this change are a) the lack of formal similarity between the verb endings -ĀBŌ / -ĒBŌ, and -IAM / -AM; b) the use of -IAM / -AM as both future and present subjunctive markers; c) the confusion between future forms and perfective forms of the first conjugation (CANTĀBIT / CANTĀBIMUS 'he/we will sing' and CANTĀVIT / CANTĀVIMUS 'he/we sang'); and d) the lack of distinction between third person singular future (VENDĔT 'he/she will sell'), and third person singular present (VENDĬT 'he/she sells'), given the fusion into the phoneme /e/ of Ĕ, Ē and Ĭ in final syllables.

In order to emphasize situations that did not correspond to the present, Latin speakers started to use alternative constructions that did not originally convey a future reference. EŌ ('I am going') AD ('to') CANTĀRE ('sing'), for example, was temporarily used in some early Romance languages but it was never regularized, although a similar construction is now wide spread in Modern Spanish (*voy a hacerlo* 'I am going to do it'). Also, structures with VENIŌ ('I come'), VOLŌ ('I wish'), and DĒBEŌ ('I owe') followed by the infinitive form of another verb, were later used and regularized in Spanish and other Romance languages (e.g. Romanian and Sardinian). The form HABEŌ ('I have') followed by the infinitive form of another verb was, however, one of the most frequent constructions in Vulgar Latin, and the one which originated modern future forms in various Romance languages.

In Old Spanish, for example, HABEŌ ('I have'), as in the construction CANTĀRE HABEŌ ('I have to sing') slowly acquired certain semantic features which were different from its original characteristics. Thus, HABEŌ ('I have'), which initially designated possession, came to mark intention, obligation, and finally futurity. During the Middle Ages, future forms became synthetic since they were usually written in one word: *cantaré* (*cantar* 'to sing' + *é*$_{1SG\text{-}FUT}$), *veremos* (*ver* 'to see' + *emos*$_{1PL\text{-}FUT}$). The same form could, however, be separated when one or more unstressed pronouns accompanied the verb: *cantar lo he* ('I will sing it'), *ver lo he* ('I will see it').

In the case of the structure *voy* ('I go') *a* ('to') *cantar* ('to sing'), it initially expressed spatial movement, although it later became grammaticalized to express temporal movement as well. As Westmoreland (1997) indicates, the periphrastic structure was first used in literary works to express temporal imminence or prospection in the thirteenth century, but this use did not become popular in colloquial speech until the fifteenth century and in educated speech until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Many historically and semantically oriented studies have demonstrated that periphrastic and morphological future forms are not completely equivalent and are not used interchangeably in all contexts. The fact that these forms have evolved from different etymons provides evidence to suggest that their semantic change and expansion greatly depend on their original uses and meanings. Bybee & Pagliuca (1987), for example, suggest that the initial meaning of obligation expressed by the morphological future evolved to futurity and then to supposition and

probability, whereas the initial meaning of spatial movement conveyed by the periphrastic future evolved to futurity and then to intention and certainty.

Although these two forms have acquired modal uses that are particular to each of them, they still share the function of future denotation. This expression of futurity is the crucial characteristic that allows us to compare them and investigate their uses in contexts where either form can occur.

1.2. *Studying the future*

1.2.1. The study of future forms in other languages

The conditions that determine the use of morphological and periphrastic future forms have been widely studied in English (Szmrecsanyi, 2003) and French (Poplack, 1999; Emirkinian & Sankoff, 1985; Deshaies & Laforge, 1981).

In the case of English, for example, Szmrecsanyi (2003) found that future marker distributions seem to be sensitive to contexts of negation, subordination, condition, and sentence length. As for French, Deshaies & Laforge (1981) suggest that the morphological future contains a hypothetical value, whereas the periphrastic future denotes events that are proximal to the individual. Emirkanian & Sankoff (1985), in their study of Montreal French, also find the periphrastic form to indicate proximity, whereas the morphological form is associated to non-proximal future situations, and it seems to be maintained in the presence of negation and temporal markers.

A common finding in all these studies is that certain linguistic factors are found to determine the use of either form when expressing futurity. In both English and French, for example, morphological forms are sensitive to contexts of negation, while periphrastic forms in French are determined by the proximity of the future situation.

1.2.2. The study of future forms in Spanish

As far as Spanish is concerned, research has focused on the analysis of future form distributions and sociolinguistic conditioning in various Spanish dialects (Westmoreland, 1997, Silva Corvalán & Terrell, 1989; Sedano, 1994; Almeida & Díaz, 1998). Studies performed in Caribbean regions (Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Venezuela), Andean regions (Chile), Mexico, and the US converge in that: a) the periphrastic form in Spanish (*ir a* 'go to' + INF) strongly outnumbers the morphological form; b) the two forms can occur identically in certain contexts; and c) besides futurity, the morphological future usually conveys modality (i.e. uncertainty).

Silva Corvalán & Terrell (1989), for example, studied the expression of futurity in three Caribbean countries (Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico and Venezuela), and compared them with an Andean country (Chile). Their study shows that the periphrastic future is by far (73%-94%) the most frequent form to encode future situations, and that its use reflects differences in register, rather than in dialectal variation.

Sedano (1994), in her study of Caracas Spanish, suggests that the morphological future is associated with temporal distance and uncertainty. Besides being the most frequent form in Caracas Spanish, the periphrastic future can be used in any type of temporal situation, but it is categorically used when the future action is immediate.

Gutiérrez (1995), in turn, examined twenty bilingual speakers born in the United States, and compared them with monolingual speakers from Mexico City and Morelia, Mexico. He found that the periphrastic form (PF), compared to the morphological form (MF) and the simple present form (PS), was used almost categorically in the Southwest (PF: 89%; MF: 4%; PS: 7%), and in Morelia (PF: 73%; MF: 8.5%; PS: 18.5%), but less categorically in Mexico City (PF: 51%; MF: 23%; PS: 26%). His findings suggest that the Mexican-American variety of the Southwest is more similar to the popular variety of Morelia than to the educated variety of Mexico City, and that the displacement of the morphological form may be at a more advanced stage in the first two varieties than in the third.

Contrary to the above studies, Almeida & Díaz (1998), and Díaz & Almeida (2000), in their study of Canary Island Spanish, show that the morphological form is more frequent in oral data and that its use has increased since the 1970s. The fact that the morphological future is associated with prestigious speech has motivated upper class, young, and female speakers to employ it more often. Moreover, the speaker's desire to distance him/herself from the future situation seems to be the pragmatic strategy that triggers the employment of the morphological form. The absence of a syntactic subject and the type of verb (action, state, and utterance verb) seem to also favor the use of the morphological form.

Given that the majority of Spanish dialects show a tendency to favor the use of the periphrastic future form over the morphological future form, it seems that Canary Island Spanish is undergoing a change in progress. The fact that the use of the morphological form has increased during the last three or four decades in the speech of females and youngsters, further suggests the possibility of such change in Canary Island Spanish.

1.2.3. The study of future forms in Colombian Spanish

As for Colombian Spanish, only a handful of studies have focused on examining periphrastic and morphological future forms. Montes (1962), one of the first authors to analyze this subject matter by means of natural data, studied various future forms in popular speech novels, newspapers, magazines and personal letters. Although his study does not provide a quantitative account of the forms, it concludes that the morphological form is rarely found in texts that represent popular speech (mainly from Western Colombia), and that the periphrastic form is predominant in this country. In Central Colombia, specifically in the area of Bogotá, the morphological form is still found to be abundant, which the author attributes to the traditional and archaic characteristics of this particular dialect.

Berschin (1987) compares periphrastic and morphological forms in Colombian and Peninsular Spanish. He concludes that there is a dialectal difference given that the American dialects use the periphrastic forms more frequently than the peninsular dialects. Furthermore, the author states that there is also a stylistic difference between the two forms since the periphrastic future is more common in spoken language.

Orozco (2005), in his analysis of Northern Colombian Spanish, finds that the periphrastic form is more frequent than the morphological form (45.9% vs. 18.2%), and that imminence of the future situation, absence of time markers and multi-syllabic verbs exert a favorable effect on the use of the periphrastic future.

As shown, although the periphrastic future form is more frequent in Caribbean dialects (Northern Colombia) and Andean dialects (Western Colombia), the morphological future form is still frequent in written data in Central Andean dialects (e.g. Bogotá Spanish).

1.3. *Research questions*

This study addresses specific questions regarding the use of morphological and periphrastic future forms in Bogotá Spanish. First, what is the general distribution of these two forms in this particular dialect? Is the periphrastic form the more frequent form? What are the factors that favor or disfavor the use of each form?

Second, what is the role of written vs. oral register in the choice of future forms? Are upper class speakers from Bogotá using the morphological form more often in oral data? If the periphrastic form is the more frequent form in oral data, is it also the more frequent form in written data?

2. Methodology

2.1. *Object of study and its specifications*

As previously mentioned, the present study limits its analysis to the temporal use of morphological and periphrastic future forms. The only contexts examined are those in which the two forms are found in alternation, and no particular modal function applies. That is, sentences such as (3), in which the morphological form conveys probability, instead of futurity, are not considered:

(3) *¿Qué hora será?*
what time to be-$_{3SG\text{-}FUT}$
'What time would it be?'

Also excluded from the analysis are sentences such as (4), in which the periphrastic form conveys its literal meaning of spatial movement, and sentences such as (5), in which either the morphological or the periphrastic form may be used as an imperative form:

(4) *Los domingos voy a visitar a mis padres*
the Sundays go-$_{1SG\text{-}PRES}$ to visit-$_{INF}$ to my parents
'On Sundays I go to visit my parents'

(5) *Hablarás con tu padre mañana*
speak-$_{2SG\text{-}FUT}$ with your father tomorrow
'You will talk to your father tomorrow'

2.2. *Corpora*

In order to study the factors that condition the use of morphological and periphrastic future forms in Bogotá Spanish, two corpora are used. The first corpus contains oral data and is comprised of fourteen interviews with upper class speakers (7 females and 7 males) who have "equal status" professions[2]. The interviews are taken from the macrocorpus of the linguistic

[2] At the time of the interview, all speakers had professions and/or occupations that were socially and economically balanced: two university professors, one graphic designer, four attorneys, one journalist, one engineer, two doctors, one priest, and one social service volunteer.

norm in the main Hispanic cities (Samper-Padilla et al., 1998), are approximately half an hour long and follow the traditional format of sociolinguistic interviews (an interviewer asks questions regarding the interviewee's job, family, personal experiences, etc.). This corpus includes information about the interviewee's occupation, age, and gender.

The second corpus contains written data drawn from five well-known local newspapers available online: *El Espectador*, *El Tiempo*, *La República*, *El Nuevo Siglo*, *Portafolio*. Although the first two newspapers are popular nation-wide, the news is clearly presented from a centralized perspective (they both originate in Bogotá and have several sections dedicated to the capital city and its surrounding areas, as well as to the nation's governmental, economic and social systems, also mostly established here). Both the third and the fifth newspapers are primarily designed for readers interested in financial and economic news, mainly economists, businessmen, managers, or financial analysts. Finally, the fourth newspaper is considered to be highly traditional and generally focused on news that concerns the capital city.

We selected only the reader's opinions sections to obtain data that would approximate the informality of oral data. Although the reader's place of origin is not clearly stated in all cases, we assume that they have all been born in Bogotá, or have lived there most of their lives, given their interest in commenting on topics exclusively related to the development of the city. Even in the case of the two nationally popular newspapers (*El Espectador* and *El Tiempo*), it was possible to distinguish the speakers from Bogotá by closely analyzing dialectal variation (e.g. specific lexical elements particular to certain Colombian regions), and the speaker's interest in discussing particular topics related to Bogotá (e.g. neighborhood security, school system, local government).

Furthermore, the fact that all readers comment on political, social, and economic situations, access the internet to share their opinions, and use complex syntactic and lexical forms, strongly suggests that they all belong to the upper class or are highly educated speakers[3]. Unfortunately, this corpus does not include the speakers' ages, which does not allow us to include this factor in the analysis of these particular data.

2.3. *Conditioning factors*[4]

2.3.1. Social factors

The social factors analyzed in the present study are the speaker's gender (M: Male; F: Female), the speaker's age (A: 25-34; B: 35-54; C: 55 or more); and the newspaper (E: *El Espectador*; T: *El Tiempo*; R: *La República*; N: *El Nuevo Siglo*; P: *Portafolio*). Here, gender and age are selected since they were found to significantly influence the use of morphological future forms in Canary Island Spanish (Almeida & Díaz, 1998; Díaz & Almeida, 2000). The newspaper was also an important factor since there seems to be a difference between newspapers in terms of their audiences and their presentation of the news (*El Tiempo* and *El Espectador* are the most popular nationwide; *La República* and *El Nuevo Siglo* are more concerned with local news; *Portafolio* is mainly focused on economic news).

In the case of the first set of data (oral interviews), only the speaker's gender and age were considered. The age distribution was carefully established so that similar amounts of speakers

[3] For example, in many of the cases found these readers are well-known politicians, government officials, or simply people who have become popular within the local or national setting given their public roles in the community.
[4] A table which clearly summarizes all factors is included in Appendix A.

could be obtained per age group (A: four speakers; B: six speakers; C: four speakers). In the case of the second set of data (written opinions), only the speaker's gender and the newspaper were considered, given that age was not consistently provided in the newspapers.

2.3.2. Linguistic factors

The linguistic factors analyzed in both sets of data are person/number features of the verb, verb class, subject type, clause type, negation of future situation, time proximity of future situation, certainty of future situation, intentionality of future situation, and number of syllables in the verb.

2.3.2.1. Person and number features of the verb

In Spanish, the subject of the sentence can be identified in the verb by its morphological configuration. There are six possible person/number combinations. For the morphological future, there are six morphemes: first person singular (*-é*), second person singular (*-ás*), third person singular (*-á*), first person plural (*-emos*), second person plural (*-éis*), or third person plural (*-án*). For the periphrastic future, there are six possible verb conjugations: first person singular (*voy* 'I go'), second person singular (*vas* 'you go'), third person singular (*va* 's/he goes'), first person plural (*vamos* 'we go'), second person plural (*vái*s 'you$_{-PL}$ go'), or third person plural (*van* 'they go'). In the present study, the second person plural (*-éis* or *vái*s) is not analyzed given that this form is never uttered in Colombian Spanish.

Although this factor was not found to significantly influence the occurrence of the morphological future in other studies (e.g. Almeida & Díaz, 1998), it is still considered in the present study since it may favor the occurrence of either future form in Bogotá Spanish.

2.3.2.2. Verb class

The classification of future-marked verbs using the factor group 'verb class' was inspired by Givon's (1984) semantic considerations, and by Almeida & Díaz' (1998), and Díaz & Almeida's (2000) verb categorization. In Almeida & Díaz' (1998), and Díaz & Almeida's (2000) studies, 'action', 'state' and 'speech' verbs were found to significantly favor the occurrence of the morphological future. This factor is also considered here with the expectation that certain verb classes favor either future form. In the present study, the five classes of verbs considered are outlined below:

a. Action verbs: Verbs that literally indicate physical movement or action, such as *volar* 'to fly', *caminar* 'to walk', *ver* 'to see', or *oir* 'to hear'. Verbs that indicate emotional or abstract movement or action, such as *aumentar* 'to increase', *disminuir* 'to decrease', *crecer* 'to grow', or *hacer* 'to do'.

b. State verbs: Verbs that indicate existence such as *ser* 'to be', *estar* 'to be', *existir* 'to exist', or *haber* 'there is/are'. Also, verbs that express occurrence such as *manifestar* 'to manifest', or *destacar* 'to stand out'.

c. Speech verbs: Verbs that indicate communication or utterance production, such as *decir* 'to say', *hablar* 'to speak', *exigir* 'to demand', *preguntar* 'to ask', or *escribir* 'to write'.

d. Mental verbs: Verbs that indicate psychological, cognitive, or mental processes, such as *pensar* 'to think', *aprender* 'to learn', *resolver* 'to resolve', or *afectar* 'to affect'.

e. Other verbs: All other verbs that may have a modal function, or that may not be classified in any of the above categories, such as *tener* 'to have', *querer* 'to want', *tocar* 'to have to', *tener que* 'to have to', *gastar* 'to spend', or *ganar* 'to win'.

2.3.2.3. Subject type

Given that subject type (i.e. absence of syntactic subject) was found to favor the morphological form in Canary Island Spanish, we also analyze this factor in the present study. Only three kinds were considered: subjects expressed morphologically instead of syntactically (6); subjects expressed pronominally (7); and subjects expressed in a phrase (8):

(6) ***Voy*** *a trabajar*
go-$_{3SG\text{-}PRES}$ to work-$_{INF}$
'I am going to work'

(7) ***Yo*** *trabajaré*
I work-$_{1SG\text{-}FUT}$
'I will work'

(8) ***Mis hijos*** *van a trabajar*
My sons go-$_{3PL\text{-}PRES}$ to work-$_{INF}$
'My sons are going to work'

2.3.2.4. Clause type

This factor is considered given that the morphological form may be motivated by contexts of subordination, as seems to occur in English (Szmrecsanyi, 2003). The clause type factor is comprised of only two kinds of clauses: main clauses that contain the future form (9), and subordinate clauses that contain the future form (10):

(9) ***Tendremos*** *que hacer algo*
have-$_{1PL\text{-}FUT}$ that do-$_{INF}$ something
'We will have to do something'

(10) *Mis hijos dicen* ***que van a trabajar***
My sons say-$_{3PL\text{-}PRES}$ that go-$_{3PL\text{-}PRES}$ to work-$_{INF}$
'My sons say that they are going to work'

2.3.2.5. Negation of future situation

Another linguistic factor taken into account is the negation or non-negation of the future situation, given that in English and French negation is found to correlate with the morphological form (Szmrecsanyi, 2003; Emirkanian & Sankoff, 1985; Poplack, 1999). Negation of the future situation is usually expressed by a preverbal *no* 'not', or by other negative expressions such as *nunca* 'never', *nada* 'nothing', *nadie* 'nobody', among others (11). Non-negation is expressed when such markers are absent (12):

(11) ***No*** *trabajaré*
Not work-$_{3SG\text{-}FUT}$
'I will not work'

(12) *Vamos a trabajar en la fábrica*
go-$_{1PL\text{-}PRES}$ to work-$_{INF}$ in the factory
'We are going to work in the factory'

2.3.2.6. Proximity of the future situation

Proximal or immediate future situations were found to significantly favor the occurrence of the periphrastic form in Spanish (Sedano, 1994; Orozco, 2005) and French (Deshaies & Laforge, 1981; Emirkanian & Sankoff, 1985). In contrast, non-proximal future situations were found to favor the morphological form in French (Emirkanian & Sankoff, 1985). Similarly, in the present study the proximity of the future situation is also considered.

Thus, definite or specific temporal expressions such as *ahora* 'now', *ya* 'already', *esta noche* 'tonight', or *mañana* 'tomorrow' mark the future situation as proximal (13). Definite or specific temporal expressions such as *la próxima semana* ('next week'), *este mes* ('this month'), *el próximo semestre* ('next semester'), mark the future situation as non-proximal (14). Absence of time markers and occurrence of indefinite temporal expressions such as *algún día* 'some day', *en el futuro* 'in the future', *con el tiempo* 'in time', *siempre* 'always', or *nunca* 'never', mark the future situation as unspecified (15)[5]:

(13) ***Mañana*** v*oy a trabajar*
tomorrow go-$_{1SG\text{-}PRES}$ to work-$_{INF}$
'I am going to work tomorrow'

(14) ***La próxima semana*** *viajarán a Medellín*
the next week travel-$_{3PL\text{-}FUT}$ to Medellín
'Next week they will travel to Medellín'

(15) ***Algún día*** *van a trabajar*
some day go-$_{3PL\text{-}PRES}$ to work-$_{INF}$
'Some day they are going to work'

[5] Refer to section 4 for suggestions for future research regarding the distinction between absence of time markers and indefinite temporal expressions.

2.3.2.7. Certainty of future situation

Since Sedano (1994) shows that uncertain future situations favor the occurrence of the morphological form, we also incorporate this variable into the analysis, and hypothesize that it will favor the same form.

The speaker's certainty about the occurrence of the future situation is generally determined by referential or contextual elements which, in some cases, can be signaled by the speaker's expressed knowledge or belief that something will happen in the future. In this sense, expressions such as *sé que* 'I know that', or *estoy seguro de que* 'I'm sure that' clearly convey the speaker's certainty concerning a future event. Expressions such as *posiblemente* 'possibly' or *tal vez* 'perhaps' usually indicate that the speaker recognizes the possibility that the situation will take place in the future. Expressions such as *no sé si...* 'I don't know if…', or *no estoy seguro/a de si...* 'I'm not sure if...', on the other hand, express the speaker's complete uncertainty about the future event.

2.3.2.8. Intentionality in the future situation

As suggested by Sedano (1994), the fact that the future situation is presented by the speaker as either involving or not involving intentionality can also be semantically or pragmatically indicated, and may have an effect in the occurrence of morphological or periphrastic forms. Verbs such as *aprovechar* 'to take advantage of' and *seguir* 'to continue', in examples (16-17), suggest the speaker's intention to accomplish a future action.

(16) *Como no llueve hoy,* ***aprovecharé*** *para arreglar el jardín*
since not rain-3SG-PRES today take advantage-1SG-FUT to fix-INF the garden
'Since it is not raining today, I will take advantage of the opportunity to fix the garden'

(17) ***Va a seguir*** *sus estudios para conseguir trabajo*
go-3SG-PRES to continue-INF his studies to find-INF job
'He is going to continue his studies in order to find a job'

Impersonal expressions such as *lloverá* 'it will rain' in (18), or passive constructions such as *se hará justicia* 'justice will be made' in (19), suggest that the speaker cannot act upon the situation and that it is not his/her intention to make it happen.

(18) *En el periódico anuncian que* ***lloverá***
in the newspaper announce-3PL-PRES that rain-3SG-IMPERSONAL-FUT
'According to the newspaper, it will rain today'

(19) *Algún día* ***se hará justicia***
Some day PASSPRON do-3SG-FUT justice
'Someday justice will be done

2.3.2.9. Number of syllables in the main verb

Finally, the number of syllables in the main verb is also coded. Given that Orozco (2005) found multi-syllabic verbs to favor the use of the periphrastic future in Northern Colombia Spanish, we hypothesize that the length of the main verb may also have an effect in the use of either form. The non-inflected forms of verbs in Spanish can be composed of one syllable (20), two syllables (21), three syllables (22), or four to five syllables (23):

(20) ***Será*** *mejor votar por otra persona* (ser)
be-$_{3SG-\ -FUT}$ better vote-$_{INF}$ for other person
'It will be better to vote for someone else'

(21) *Algún día se* ***hará*** *justicia* (ha-cer)
Some day $_{PASSPRON}$ do-$_{3SG-FUT}$ justice
'Someday justice will be done'

(22) *Hoy se* ***emitirá*** *el anuncio* (e-mi-tir)
today $_{PASSPRON}$ emit-$_{3SG-FUT}$ the announcement
'The announcement will be emitted today'

(23) *La comisión* ***descalificará*** *al jugador* (des-ca-li-fi-car)
the comission disqualify-$_{3SG-FUT}$ to the player
'The commission will disqualify the player'

3. Results

The results for this study were analyzed using the statistical program Goldvarb 2.0 (Rand & Sankoff, 1990). The data analyzed yielded a total of 352 cases, from which 201 were instances of the morphological future, and 151 were instances of the periphrastic future. From the 144 cases obtained in the oral corpus, 30 were instances of the morphological future, and 114 were instances of the periphrastic future. From the 208 cases obtained in the written corpus, 171 were instances of the morphological future, and 37 were instances of the periphrastic future. Table 1 below clearly summarizes the total number of cases obtained:

	Oral data		**Written data**		**Total**
	N. of cases	%	N. of cases	%	
Morphological	30	20.8	171	82.2	201
Periphrastic	114	79.2	37	17.8	151
Total	**144**	100	**208**	100	**352**

Table 1: Summary of total number of cases obtained

As shown, the number of cases of morphological and periphrastic future forms drastically changes according to register. In the oral data, for example, the morphological future is only used 20.8% of the time, whereas in the written data it is used 82.2% of the time. In turn, the periphrastic future is used 79.2% of the time in the oral data, and only 17.8% of the time in the

written data. Contrary to our expectations, the periphrastic form is the most common form in oral data, even in the case of upper class speakers who have received formal instruction. Although it was expected that an increase would be found in the use of the morphological form in written style, it is still surprising to see that it greatly surpasses the periphrastic form in frequency.

Looking at the statistical analysis of the conditioning factors that favor and disfavor the occurrence of the morphological future form, we find that out of all twelve factor groups, four are significant predictors of its occurrence in the oral data (gender; number/person; verb class; proximity), and five are selected as significant in the written data (gender; newspaper; verb class; negation; proximity).

Gender, verb class, and proximity are the only factors selected as statistically significant in both corpora. Within the verb class category, all verb types were analyzed by the program for the oral data, but not for the written data: the 'mental' verb category was reported as a "knockout", which was solved by regrouping 'mental' verbs with 'other' verbs. In this 'mental' verb category, there were 11 cases, which corresponded to the application value (the morphological future form, in this case). These 11 tokens became part of the 51 tokens of the new 'other' verb category (43= Morphological; 8= Periphrastic). Thus, 32 cases of the morphological form (out of 51 tokens) originally came from the 'other' verb category.

Also, in the case of the 'number/person' category (selected as significant in the oral data), the second person singular and the first person plural were reported as "knockouts". One way to solve this problem was to discard the second person singular data (it could not be regrouped with a similar 'person/number' factor), and to regroup the first person plural with the first person singular. In the second person singular category there was 1 case, which corresponded to the non-application value (the periphrastic future form), and in the first person plural category, there were 7 cases, which also corresponded to the non-application value (the periphrastic future form). These 7 tokens became part of the 26 tokens of the new first person singular/plural category (1= Morphological; 25= Periphrastic). Thus, 18 cases of the periphrastic form (out of 26 tokens) originally came from the first person singular category.

Table 2, below summarizes the factors reported as statistically significant for the occurrence of the morphological form:

	ORAL DATA (INPUT .078)			WRITTEN DATA (INPUT .885)		
	N	%	Weight	N	%	Weight
Gender						
Males	21/51	41	.832	144/171	84	.552
Females	9/93	9	.293	27/37	72	.276
Newspaper						
E (*El Espectador*)	n/a			94/109	86	.630
T (*El Tiempo*)				24/40	60	.125
R (*La República*)				13/16	81	.368
N (*El Nuevo Siglo*)				13/14	92	.753
P (*Portafolio*)				27/29	93	.610
Number/Person						
1sg	1/26	3	.073	n/s		
3sg	21/82	25	.635			
1pl	--	--	--			
3pl	8/35	22	.644			
Verb class						
Action	6/48	12	.351	57/73	78	.324
State	5/39	12	.300	67/74	90	.707
Speech	4/19	21	.569	4/10	40	.094
Mental	2/18	11	.375	--	--	--
Others	13/20	65	.965	43/51	84	.556
Negation						
Affirmative	n/s			155/187	82	.543
Negative				16/21	76	.177
Proximity						
Proximal	6/17	35	.765	5/12	41	.140
Non-proximal	9/17	52	.934	36/44	81	.474
Unspecified	15/110	13	.356	130/152	85	.543
	Log Likelihood: -39.297 Significance: .068			Log Likelihood: -72.394 Significance: .041		

--: Knockouts **n/a**: not applicable **n/s**: not selected

Table 2: Factors that significantly favor the occurrence of the morphological form.

In order to examine possible relations between some of the statistically significant factors, several cross-tabulation analyses were performed. Cross-tabulation analyses between the 'gender' 'number/person', and 'verb class' categories, were the only ones that showed some interesting results.

Looking at the relation between 'gender' and 'number/person', for example, we find that both male and female speakers increase their use of the morphological future in third person forms (singular and plural) according to register. However, female speakers seem to have a

more dramatic increase (3rd singular: 13% to 81%; 3rd plural: 10% to 61%) than male speakers (3rd singular: 47% to 85%; 3rd plural: 40% to 87%). A closer look at the number of tokens analyzed indicates that very few cases were available in some cells (3rd plural produced by males in oral data: 6/15; 3rd plural produced by females in oral data: 2/20; 3rd plural produced by females in written data: 8/13; 1st person singular produced by males in written data: 0/3, and by females: 1/2; 1st person plural produced by females in written data: 1/1). A clearer summary is provided in Table 3 below:

	ORAL DATA				WRITTEN DATA			
NUMBER/ PERSON	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 sg	1/5	20	0/21	0	0/3	0	1/2	50
3 sg	14/30	47	7/52	13	92/108	85	17/21	81
1 pl	---	---	---	---	10/12	83	1/1	100
3 pl	6/15	40	2/20	10	42/48	87	8/13	61

Table 3: Results of the cross-tabulation analysis of 'gender' and 'number/person'

Similar to these results, we find that regarding the relation between 'gender' and 'verb class', both male and female speakers tend to increase their use of the morphological forms in written data. Given that 'mental' verbs could not be analyzed as a single group in the written data (they were "knockouts" for the morphological form), it is impossible to account for any changes between the two registers. 'Action' and 'state' verbs actually show an increase of at least 50% (Action: 25% for males and 3% for females in oral data to 83% for males and 54% for females in written data; State: 37% by males and 6% by females in oral data to 91% by males and 88% by females in written data). 'Other' verbs only show an increase of at least 7% (78% by males and 54% by females in oral style to 85% by males and 80% by females in written style). Interestingly enough, 'speech' verbs do not show an increase in the speech of male speakers (57% in oral data to 37% in written data). However, looking more closely at the number of tokens, we find that in some of these cases very few tokens are available for the analysis (state-males-oral: 3/8; speech-males-oral: 4/7; others-males-oral: 7/9; speech-males-written: 3/8; speech-females-written: 1/2; others-females-written: 4/5). A clearer summary is provided in Table 4 below:

	ORAL DATA				WRITTEN DATA			
VERB CLASS	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Action	5/20	25	1/28	3	50/60	83	7/13	54
State	3/8	37	2/31	6	52/57	91	15/17	88
Speech	4/7	57	0/12	0	3/8	37	1/2	50
Mental	2/7	28	0/11	0	---	---	---	---
Others	7/9	78	6/11	54	39/46	85	4/5	80

Table 4: Results of the cross-tabulation analysis of 'gender' and 'verb class'

Finally, concerning the relation between 'verb class' and 'number/person', we find some interesting tendencies for 'action' and 'state' verbs in particular. Similar to the results in the previous cross-tabulation analysis, the use of the morphological future greatly increases when it occurs in 'action' and 'state' verbs in written form (there is an increase of at least 50%). Although 'action' verbs do not statistically favor the occurrence of this form (.351 in oral data;

.324 in written data), 'state' verbs do in the written data (.707). The cross-tabulation results in Table 5 below suggest that written data triggers an increase in the occurrence of the morphological future in both types of verbs. More specifically, in third person (singular and plural), the number of tokens and percentages are actually very similar: action-3sg-oral: 4/23 (17%); state-3sg-oral: 4/26 (15%); action-3pl-oral: 2/13 (15%); state-3pl-oral: 1/12 (8%); action-3sg-written: 37/46 (80%); state-3sg-written: 41/45 (91%); action-3pl-written: 16/21 (76%); state-3pl-written: 21/23 (91%). Table 5 below clearly shows these results:

	ORAL DATA				WRITTEN DATA			
NUMBER/ PERSON	Action		State		Action		State	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 sg	0/12	0	0/1	0	0/1	0	0/0	0
3 sg	4/23	17	4/26	15	37/46	80	41/45	91
1 pl	---	---	---	---	4/5	80	5/6	83
3 pl	2/13	15	1/12	8	16/21	76	21/23	91

Table 5: Results of the cross-tabulation analysis of 'verb class' and 'number/person'

The results of the cross-tabulation analyses indicate that a) the morphological future is more frequently used by males and females in third person (singular and plural), in written data; b) although both females and males increase their use of the morphological future in 'action', 'state' and 'other' verbs in written data, females show a more drastic change; c) in terms of 'action' and 'state' verbs, both females and males show an increase in use of the morphological form in written data. These findings present some evidence for the claim that register (i.e. written data) directly correlates with the type of future form employed.

4. Discussion

From the account of conditioning factors that statistically favor the use of the morphological form (illustrated in Table 2 above) we see that in terms of the social factors, these results show some interesting tendencies. First of all, contrary to our initial predictions, male speakers actually favor the use of the morphological future in both oral and written data (.832: oral; .552: written). Female speakers, on the other hand, disfavor this form in both corpora (.293: oral; .276: written). The fact that male speakers favor the morphological form in Bogotá Spanish suggests that this dialect differs from the Canary Island dialect since in the latter females were found to favor the use of the morphological future (Almeida & Díaz, 1998; Díaz & Almeida, 2000). The fact that the periphrastic future may be seen as a more innovative form in Bogotá Spanish would explain the female speakers' tendency to favor its occurrence in both oral and written data. This is, however, a tentative remark and further study of larger corpora should be undertaken to reach more definitive conclusions.

As for newspaper, the results show that *El Espectador* favors the use of the morphological future (.630), whereas *El Tiempo* disfavors it (.125). This result is particularly puzzling, given that these newspapers are equally popular in Colombia, and they present a similar news format.

In fact, a closer look at the readers' opinions sections presented in each of these newspapers indicates that they are actually organized differently in each paper. In *El Espectador*, for example, some of the readers who share their opinions are always the same, and they appear to be more concerned with political, social and economic issues, which they openly criticize in their daily commentaries. In *El Tiempo*, on the other hand, the readers are usually different every day

and most of them are actually Bogotá citizens who write their opinions about various issues concerning their own neighborhoods or places of employment. Given this difference, a possible reason for these opposing tendencies may be related to the type of readers who share their opinions.

Concerning the linguistic factors, we find that in the 'number/person' category, third person favors the occurrence of the morphological future (singular: .633; plural: .644). This is not surprising if we take into account that first person forms are shown to favor the periphrastic form in other Spanish dialects (Sedano, 1994; Orozco, 2005). Unlike third person forms, first person forms are directly associated with the speaker (the speaker is committing him/herself to the future action). The fact that the morphological form correlates with third person may be an indication of the speaker's intention to distance him/herself from the future action when referring to some entity other than him/herself. Although this reasoning resembles Sedano's (1994) conclusions, more evidence from a larger corpus is needed to confirm or disconfirm it.

In terms of verb class, 'other' verbs (e.g. modals) significantly favor the morphological future in both types of data, while 'state' and 'speech' verbs differ drastically according to register: 'state' verbs favor the morphological form in the written data (.707), but disfavor it in the oral data (.300); 'speech' verbs favor the morphological form in the oral data (.569), but disfavor it in the written data (.094). As shown in the previous section, a cross-tabulation analysis between 'verb class' and 'gender' shows that females greatly favor the morphological form in 'state' verbs, in the written data. A cross-tabulation between 'verb class' and 'number/person' indicates that 'state' verbs greatly favor the morphological form in third person (singular and plural), in written data. Thus, the correlation between 'state' verbs and the morphological form in the written data may be related to its use by females, and its occurrence in third person (singular and plural).

As for negation, it is interesting to find that affirmative future situations favor the occurrence of the morphological future (.543), given that in other languages negation is a key element that favors the occurrence of this form (e.g. in English Szmerecsany, 2003; in Canadian French Emirkanian & Sankoff, 1985; Poplack, 1999). Unfortunately, it is difficult to draw any further conclusions since this factor was not significant in the oral data, and the cross tabulation analyses did not reveal any particularly striking information.

Moreover, proximal and non-proximal future situations favor the use of the morphological form in oral data (.765 and .934, respectively), and disfavor it in written data (.140 and .474, respectively). The fact that immediate or proximal future situations are found in other studies to favor the use of the periphrastic form (Sedano, 1994; Orozco, 2005; Almeida & Díaz, 1998; Díaz & Almeida, 2000), suggests the occurrence of a tendency particular to the present data. Although it may seem surprising that unspecified future situations favor the use of the periphrastic form in oral data, a more detailed analysis of this particular subset of the data may help clarify the results.

95 out of the 114 cases of the periphrastic future occurring in the oral data were coded as unspecified. We found that 38 out of these 95 cases (40% of the tokens) clearly indicate futurity, as exemplified in (24):

(24) *Voy a ver qué fue lo que pasó*
'I'm going to see what happened'

Also, 28 out of the 95 cases (29.4% of the tokens) actually indicate the speakers' predictions, as shown in (25), and 19 out of the 95 cases (20% of the tokens) indicate the speakers' actions in a hypothetical situation, as in (26):

(25) *Se va a armar un problema terrible*
'A great problem is going to come up'

(26) *Decimos: "vamos a hacer una fogata"*
'We say: "we're going to make a fire"'

The rest of the unspecified future situations, 10 cases (10.6% of the tokens), show other modal functions that are closely related to hypothetical situations and predictions. Thus, from the 95 cases of unspecified situations, only 40% are clearly related to futurity. A clearer account can be found in Table 6 as follows:

Type of unspecified future situation	N	%
Futurity (temporal, not spatial, movement)	38	40
Speaker's predictions	28	29.5
Speaker's actions in hypothetical situations	19	20
Other modal uses (hypothetical uses)	10	10.5
Total	**95**	**100**

Table 6: Types of unspecified future situations in oral data

As shown on Table 6, the correlation between the periphrastic future and unspecified situations in the oral data becomes clearer: the PF is used to express not only futurity but also modality. That is, the data suggest that the periphrastic future has acquired modal uses that have been exclusively associated with the morphological future form (predictions, hypotheses, etc.). This tendency of the PF to express modality may not be very surprising when we consider that the PF has historically been used to entail intention and prediction (e.g. Aaron, 2006).

However, to draw stronger conclusions, it would be necessary to analyze a larger corpus where unspecified future situations are coded separately from non-temporally marked situations. Although Orozco (2005) included presence and absence of time markers in his analysis, he only classified proximity into 'near' and 'distant' future situations. Given this, it would be interesting to see how the interaction of these two factors ('presence/absence of time markers' and 'proximal/non-proximal/unspecified future situations') affects the occurrence of periphrastic and morphological forms in both oral and written data.

Finally, although the number of syllables of the main verb was not selected as significantly predicting the occurrence of either future form, it is interesting to note that verbs with one or two syllables are more frequently used in both types of data than verbs with three or more syllables: oral data: 100 tokens (1-2 syll.); 44 tokens (3+ syll.); written data: 137 tokens (1-2 syll.); 71 tokens (3+ syll.). As Table 7 indicates, there is a tendency for morphological forms to occur more frequently in short verbs, in both data types (24/30 in the oral corpus [80%], and 118/171 in the written corpus [69%]). Periphrastic forms also show such a tendency in the oral corpus (76/113 [67%]), but not as much in the written corpus (19/37 [51%]). As indicated by the results of a chi-square analysis, the distribution is significant in the written corpus ($p \leq 0.05$):

	ORAL DATA				WRITTEN DATA			
	M		P		M		P	
# SYLLABLES	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-2 syllables	24	80	76	67	118	69	19	51
3 + syllables	6	20	38	33	53	31	18	49
Total	**30**	**100**	**113**	**100**	**171**	**100**	**37**	**100**
	χ2 = 1.98981818181818 Signif. (.05 level), should be ≥ 3.84 *p ≤ 0.20* The distribution **is not significant**.				χ^2 = 4.21689639404843 *p ≤ 0.05* The distribution **is significant**.			

Table 7: Chi-Square analysis of the factor 'number of syllables of the main verb'.

5. Conclusions

The data analyzed in the present study show that although the periphrastic future form is more frequently used in oral data (79.2%), the morphological form is still abundantly used in written data (82.2%). The results obtained from the statistical analysis indicate that male speakers, third person (singular and plural), 'speech' and 'other' verbs, and proximal and non-proximal future situations statistically favor the occurrence of the morphological future form in oral data. Male speakers, certain newspapers (*El Espectador*, *El Nuevo Siglo*, *Portafolio*), 'state' and 'other' verbs, affirmative statements, and unspecified future situations statistically favor the occurrence of the morphological future form in written data.

These results also suggest that Bogotá Spanish is, in some aspects, different from other Spanish dialects. First, unlike Canary Island female speakers, Bogotá female speakers do not favor the morphological future form in either register. This may suggest that the periphrastic form is considered an innovative form in Bogotá Spanish, not a marginal form.

Second, contrary to what was found in Venezuelan Spanish (Sedano, 1994), and in Northern Colombian Spanish (Orozco, 2005), proximal or immediate future situations do not always favor the use of the periphrastic future form. Speakers of Bogotá Spanish actually favor the morphological form when proximal or non-proximal future situations are present in the oral corpus. It is shown in our discussion section that although unspecified future situations favor the use of the periphrastic form in the oral data, a closer look at the tokens suggests that Bogotá speakers are employing this future form in this type of situations to express modality (predictions, hypotheses).

Although these divergent results are relevant and interesting for the investigation of future forms in Spanish, it is important to mention that the present study is extremely preliminary. In order to provide stronger generalizations, it will be necessary to analyze a larger corpus where other socio-economic levels and Colombian dialects are included and where other types of written data are analyzed (various newspapers sections, advertisements, letters, etc.). Furthermore, more current data (especially in the case of the oral corpus) would be necessary to examine possible changes in progress.

Finally, future research should be undertaken in order to provide a clearer account of the role of verb classes, proximity, and verb length in the occurrence of the morphological future. Due to time constraints, the present study does not analyze the 'other' verb class in more specific detail. However, it is possible that this group of verbs contains verb sub-classes that specifically determine the occurrence of either future form. Also, in this study we analyzed unspecified future situations as a set comprised of both unspecified future situations and non-temporally marked situations. However, a more detailed study should examine proximity of future situations

(proximal/non-proximal/non-specified) separately from time-marked future situations (presence or absence of time markers). Furthermore, although verb length was examined, an analysis with more tokens may show a significant relation between the number of syllables and the factor 'verb type' in the occurrence of either morphological or periphrastic future forms.

References

Aaron, J.E. 2006. *Variation and change in Spanish future temporal expression*. The University of New Mexico: PhD Dissertation.

Almeida M. and Díaz M. 1998. Aspectos sociolingüísticos de un cambio gramatical: la expresión de futuro. *Estudios filológicos*, No. 33: 7-22.

Berschin, H. 1987. Futuro analítico y futuro sintético en el español peninsular y colombiano. *LEA IX*: 101-110.

Bybee J. and Pagliuca, W. 1987. The evolution of future meaning. *Papers from the seventeenth international conference on historical linguistics*, 1985. In: Ramat, A.G., Carruba, O., and Bernini, G. (Eds.). *Current issues in linguistic theory*, *48*. Amsterdam John Benjamins. 109-22.

Deshaies D. and Laforge, E. 1981. Le futur simple et le futur proche dans le français parlé dans la ville de Québec. Québec: *Langues et Linguistique*, No. 7: 21-37.

Díaz Peralta M. and Almeida M. 2000. Sociolinguistic factors in grammatical change: the expression of the future in Canarian Spanish. *Studia Neophilologica 72*: 217-228.

Emirkanian, L. and Sankoff, D. 1985. Le futur simple et le futur périphrastique. *Les tendances dynamiques du français parlé à Montréal. Tome 1*. Québec: Governement du Québec. 189-204.

Givon, T. 1984. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction. I*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gutiérrez, M. 1995. On the future of the future tense in the Spanish of the Southwest. In: Silva Corvalán, C. (Ed.). 1995. *Spanish in four continents*. Washington: GUP: 214-226.

Montes, J.J. 1962. Sobre la categoría de futuro en el español de Colombia. *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo XVII*: 527-555.

Orozco, R. 2005. Distribution of future time forms in Northern Colombia Spanish. In: Eddington, D. (Ed.). *Selected proceedings of the seventh Hispanic Linguistics Symposium 56-65*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 56-65.

Penny, R. 2002. *A history of the Spanish language*. Second edition. Cambridge: CUP.

Poplack, S. 1999. Does the future have a future in (Canadian) French? *Probus: International Journal of Latin and Romance Linguistics*, *11* (1): 133-64.

Rand, D. and Sankoff, D. 1990. *Goldvarb, version 2: A Variable Rule Application for the Macintosh.* Montreal: Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Université de Montréal.

Samper-Padilla, J. et al. 1998. *Macrocorpus de la norma lingüística culta de las principales ciudades del mundo hispánico*. P.G. Canarias: Universidad de Las Palmas.

Sedano, M. 1994. El futuro morfológico y la expresión **ir a + infinitivo** en el español hablado en Venezuela. *Verba 21*: 225-240.

Silva-Corvalán C. and Terrell, T. 1989. Notas sobre la expresión de futuridad en el español del Caribe. *Hispanic Linguistics 2*:2. 191-208.

Szmrecsanyi, B. 2003. BE GOING TO versus WILL/SHALL. Does syntax matter? *Journal of English Linguistics*. Vol. 31. No.4: 295-323.

Westmoreland, M. 1997. The dialectalization of Spanish future tense usage. *Word*. Vol. 48, No.3: 375-394.

Appendix A: Complete account of social and linguistic factors

SOCIAL FACTORS	
Gender	
Male	
Female	
Age	**(only in oral data)**
A: 25-34 years old	
B: 35-54 years old	
C: 55 or more	
Newspaper type	**(only in written data)**
E: *El Espectador*	
T: *El Tiempo*	
R: *La República*	
N: *El Nuevo Siglo*	
P: *Portafolio*	
LINGUISTIC FACTORS	
Person/Number	
1st person singular	*trabajaré* ('I will work')
2nd person singular	*trabajarás* ('you will work')
3rd person singular	*trabajará* ('s/he will work')
1st person plural	*trabajaremos* ('we will work')
3rd person plural	*trabajarán* ('they will work')
Verb class	
Action verbs:	*caminar* 'to walk', *ver* 'to see'; *crecer* 'to grow'
State verbs:	*ser* 'to be', *haber* 'there is/are'
Speech verbs:	*decir* 'to say', *hablar* 'to speak'
Mental verbs:	*pensar* 'to think', *aprender* 'to learn'
Others:	*tener* 'to have', *querer* 'to want'; *ganar* 'to win'
Subject type	
Not expressed:	*trabajaré* ('I will work')
Pronominal:	*yo trabajaré* ('I will work')
Phrasal:	*El jefe trabajará* ('The boss will work')
Clause type	
In the main clause:	*Tendré que trabajar* (' I will have to work')
In the subordinate clause:	*El jefe dice que trabajará* ('The boss says he will work')
Negation of the future situation	
Future form negated:	*No trabajaré* ('I will not work')
Future form not negated:	*Trabajaré* ('I will work')
Time proximity of the future situation	
Proximal situation:	*Mañana trabajaré* ('I will work tomorrow')
Not proximal situation:	*En dos semanas trabajaré* ('I will work in two weeks')
Unspecified situation:	*Siempre trabajaré* ('I will always work')
Certainty of future situation	
Complete certainty:	*Sé que trabajaré* ('I know I will work')
Possibility:	*Posiblemente trabajaré* ('I will possibly work')
Complete uncertainty:	*No sé si trabajaré* ('I don't know if I will work')
Intentionality in future situation	
Intentional situation:	*Seguiré trabajando* ('I will continue working')
Not intentional situation:	*Se trabajará mucho* ('Much work will be done')
Number of syllables in the main verb	
1 syllable-verb:	*ser* → *será mejor* ('it will be better')
2 syllable-verb:	*hacer* → *haremos algo* ('we will do something')
3 syllable-verb:	*emitir* → *se emitirá eso* ('that will be emitted')
4 to 5 syllable-verb:	*descalificar* → *se descalificará* ('it will be disqualified')