HISPANIC STUDIES
review

# The Development of a Regional Morphosyntactic Feature by Learners of Spanish in a Study Abroad Setting: The Case of *Vosotros*

Angela George
University of Calgary

## Abstract

The current study investigates the development of the second person plural informal (*vosotros* as opposed to *ustedes*) by 24 Spanish majors and minors studying abroad for 14 weeks in Central Spain. Data were gathered at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester. A variety of individual and social factors, such as social networks and attitude toward Castilian Spanish, were analyzed to determine why some participants employed *vosotros* while others did not. A pre, mid, and post survey elicited *vosotros* in a variety of contexts, while questionnaires and semi-structured interviews shed light on extralinguistic factors affecting the production of this feature.

According to Geeslin (2011), "[r]esearch on variation in L2 [second language] Spanish should also take a closer look at the study abroad environment and the development of linguistic features of the region in which a learner stays" (501). Learners in the classroom may be exposed to multiple forms to convey the same function (e.g., *ustedes* and *vosotros* for second person plural) and will ultimately have to choose which form to employ. Native speakers typically employ one form consistently, but it is unclear which form learners will choose, especially given the influence of a sojourn abroad. This becomes more important as learners gain competence in the target language. Sensitivity to dialects and their registers forms a part of sociolinguistic competence, which is encompassed within language competence (Bachman, 1990).

Spain was the third most popular study abroad destination and the first most popular Spanish speaking destination in both the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years according to the most recent Open Doors Fast Facts Sheet published in 2015 by the Institute of International Education (Institute of International Education, 1998-2015). Since L2 learners of Spanish in the United States are often exposed to a variety of regional dialects, it is unclear which features from which dialects they will develop. Whether or not learners will develop regional features while studying abroad could depend on a variety of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, such as the opportunities available to interact with locals. The current study investigates the development of one salient dialectal feature, the informal second person plural *vosotros* and all of its accompanying verbal and morphological forms, in Castilian Spanish as spoken in Toledo, Spain.

# 1. Background

## 1.2. L2 Spanish Variable Features and Study Abroad

Previous research on L2 Spanish variation in the study abroad context reveals a general increase of regional features, with participants slowly becoming more native-like; however, in many cases individuals vary their production across the same context (e.g., Geeslin, 2011). Previous L2 study abroad investigations on regional features include variable phonological, morphosyntactic, and pragmatic features. Each type of feature will be discussed in more detail as it pertains to study abroad by L2 Spanish learners, with an emphasis on morphosyntactic features, the focus of the current study.

Regarding phonological features, learners in general developed their intonational patterns into more target-like productions as a result of studying abroad in Spain (Henriksen, Geeslin, & Willis, 2010). On a segmental level, study abroad resulted in the increased perceptive ability of some features, synalepha and /s/-aspiration, but not others, [θ], in 10 intermediate and advanced learners of Spanish studying abroad in Seville, Spain for six weeks (Rasmussen & Zampini, 2010). Few learners produced [θ] after studying abroad in Spain (Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2008; George, 2014; Knouse, 2013; Ringer-Hilginger, 2012). The production of [θ] in these studies was attributed to continuous contact with Castilian Spanish speakers after returning from study abroad in Spain (Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2008), stronger social networks with locals which included more contact hours with Castilian Spanish (George, 2014), a positive attitude toward pronunciation and lower proficiency level in Spanish (Knouse, 2013), and motivation to sound like a speaker from Madrid (Ringer-Hilfinger, 2012). While these studies found that relatively few learners produced [θ], Willis, Geeslin, and Henriksen (2009) encountered the opposite, where learners increased their use of [θ] after 7-weeks abroad, with the exception of one learner. They could not understand or explain why one learner decreased her production of [θ] by 42%.

Fewer studies have investigated pragmatic variable features. Shively (2011) discovered increased use of target-like requests during service encounters for seven university learners of Spanish sojourning in Spain. Since the focus of this paper is on a morphosyntactic regional feature, only studies investigating these features will be reviewed in detail.

## 1.2 Morphosyntactic and Grammatical Features

Previous studies on morphosyntactic regional features investigated objects and verb tenses. Concerning objects, learners approached native-speaker norms in their use of *leísmo*, or the use of *le(s)* as a direct object instead of *lo(s)* or *la(s)*, during their time abroad but were still not producing these forms at the same level of frequency as native speakers (Salgado-Robles, 2011; Geeslin, García-Amaya, Hasler-Barker, Henriksen, & Killam, 2010). Specifically, university learners in Northern Spain increased their use of leísmo from 17.89% to 41.50%, approaching the native-like norm of 62.60%, and learners in Southern Spain decreasing their use of leísmo from 16.44% to 12.39%, approaching the target-like norm of 10.95% (Salgado-Robles, 2011). High school learners in León Spain decreased and then increased their use of leísmo approaching native-like norms by the end of their weeks abroad, but still statistically significantly different from local native-speakers (Geeslin et al., 2010).

The verb tenses investigated in learners abroad include the use of the past, present perfect versus the preterit (Geeslin, García-Amaya, Hasler-Barker, Henriksen, & Killam, 2012; Geeslin,

Fafulas, & Kanwit, 2013; Whatley, 2013) and expression of the future (periphrastic, morphological, or present indicative forms) (Kanwit & Solon, 2013). Participants in each study were high school students on 7-week summer sojourns in Spain or Mexico. The learners in León Spain decreased their selection of the present perfect, shifting away from the target-like norm (Geeslin et al., 2012). However, the learners also progressed toward native-like usage of the predictors of use of the present perfect over the preterit, with both telicity and time of action resulting in significance for learners at Week 7, partially in line with native speakers whose only significant predictor was time of action (Geeslin et al., 2012). Similar results were found with the learners in Mexico shifting away from the Peninsular Spanish target-like norm selection of the present perfect but shifting towards the Mexican target-like norm (Geeslin et al., 2013). The opposite trend was seen in the learners in Spain, who approached the native-like norm by increasing their selection of the present perfect during their 7 weeks abroad (Geeslin et al., 2013). Finally, Spanish native speakers strongly preferred present perfect for hodiernal (today) events, while Mexican native speakers preferred preterit (Geeslin et al., 2013). Learners in each region approached these native-like norms by increasing their preference for present perfect for hodiernal events in Spain and decreasing this same preference in Mexico (Geeslin et al., 2013).

In addition to the previous studies on the selection of the preterit or the present perfect, Whatley (2013) investigated the use of the past tense–preterit, imperfect, and present perfect in 30 learners in Valencia, Spain. In terms of frequency, the advanced learners almost matched native-speaker selection of the preterit and imperfect, and resembled native-speaker usage of the present perfect after 7 weeks abroad. The mid-proficiency learners approached native-like norms of present perfect selection, while the low-proficiency learners shifted away from this norm. In terms of factors that predicted the use of each verb form, the low-proficiency Spanish learners exhibited no change over time, the mid-proficiency learners approached native-like norms, and the advanced-proficiency learners shifted further from native-like usage. The native speakers' choice of past tense was most influenced by time of action followed by inherent aspect and then discourse grounding. The advanced-proficiency learners' choice of past tense was influenced by inherent aspect and time of action during Week 1 but only inherent aspect in Week 7. By not adding discourse grounding (distinguishing foreground from background) and by deleting time of action, the advanced learners veered away from native-like patterns. Whatley (2013) attributed the advanced learners' usage to the influence of their previous Spanish language courses which could have favored the preterit, previous exposure to this feature via experiences in Spanish-speaking countries, or reaching a peak in their grammatical competency.

Kanwit and Solon (2013) found varying results in 29 learners regarding their choice of the periphrastic, morphological, and present indicative forms of the future tense after 7-weeks abroad in Mérida, Mexico and Valencia, Spain. The learners in Mexico overestimated native-like norms of the periphrastic future and underestimated native-like norms of the morphological future. These learners approached native-like selection of the present indicative. Learners in Spain also overestimated the selection of the periphrastic future, but approached native-like norms of the morphological future and remained similar to native speakers in their choice of the present indicative to indicate future.

The selection of variable verb forms by L2 learners varies widely. Learners approached native-like selection of the present indicative to indicate future in Mexico, of the morphological future in Spain, (Kanwit & Solon, 2013), and present perfect (over the preterit) in Spain (Geeslin et al., 2013; Whatley, 2013). Learners were also able to match native-speakers in terms of the predictors of use of one form over another (e.g., Geeslin et al., 2012; Whatley, 2013)

## 1.3. Individual Factors on Variation

Bayley (2005) discussed the fact that previous interlanguage variation studies attributed L2 sociolinguistic variation to a "single co-occurring contextual factor", such as the attention paid to speech, ignoring the fact that multiple factors and their relative strengths may come into play and that the single factor may not hold true for different groups of learners (p. 3). Since 2005, L2 Spanish study abroad studies have investigated the strength of a variety of factors in an attempt to explain the variation found in the results. Those studies that are relevant to the current study will be discussed next.

The studies investigating morphological and grammatical variable features tend to focus more on linguistic factors that affect the variation in L2 production of such features. However, proficiency level and contact with locals in the target language were also measured for their effects on the use of the variable features under study. For example, Geeslin et al. (2010) found that the predictors of use of *le(s)* at the end of the seven weeks León, Spain were coreferentiality, telicity, subject animacy, and higher proficiency level, matching only one of the native speakers' predictors, telicity, excluding referent gender and subject animacy. Salgado Robles (2011) found that gender of the pronoun, referent number (singular or plural), telicity, and animacy were significant predictors of use in both L2 and native speakers in Valladolid and Seville. In terms of telicity, the learners in Seville did not differ significantly from the native speakers, while the Valladolid learners approached the native-like norms. The extralinguistic factor of contact in the L2, or Spanish, was significant with more contact accounting for increased native-like use of leísmo in both groups of learners.

Hansen Edwards (2008) called for future studies to address the proficiency level needed to acquire these subtle aspects of language, such as native-like variation patterns. Whatley (2013)'s research addressed this need, explaining why high school learners in the high proficiency group matched native-like selection of the preterit and imperfect, but shifted away from native-like performance in their selection of the present perfect. The two possible causes for such a shift according to Whatley (2013) are the influence of their previous Spanish courses prior to studying abroad, since they completed, on average, more Spanish courses than the other two proficiency groups, and previous travel to other Spanish-speaking places, where the native-like norm in past tense use differs. The low proficiency group stayed the same throughout the 7-weeks, indicating that perhaps a higher proficiency level is needed, although other factors, such as the quality and quantity of native-speaker contact, could be at play. The middle proficiency group moved toward the native-like norm, perhaps providing evidence that this is the ideal proficiency level for increasing native-like performance of this variable feature in a short time abroad. The more advanced learners in Geeslin et al. (2010) most closely resembled native-like patterns of leísmo, perhaps indicating that for certain variable features, a minimum proficiency level is needed to produce the feature.

## 1.4. Use of *Vosotros* over *Ustedes* during Study Abroad

Two previous studies examined the development of *vosotros* in native-English speaking participants abroad (Reynolds-Case, 2013, Ringer-Hilfinger, 2013). The L2 university learners of Spanish in both studies increased their production of *vosotros* during their sojourns in Madrid (Reynolds-Case, 2013, Ringer-Hilfinger, 2013). In both studies, learners increased *vosotros* production, but remained distant from attaining native-like usage patterns.

In Ringer-Hilfinger (2013), 24 study abroad learners in Madrid and 6 at-home learners, at various proficiency levels, responded to a picture task, eliciting written *vosotros* commands. The at-home learners never produced *vosotros*. After 1 week in Madrid, only four participants produced *vosotros* 11.1% (16/144) of the time. This increased to 34.7% (50/144) by 12 participants after 14 weeks abroad. Then, four months after returning home to the United States, *vosotros* production decreased to 24.6% (31/126) by ten participants. Of the two significant linguistic factors, verb type (motion or perceptual) and command type (negative or affirmative), motion verbs and negative commands were the variants that favored the use of *vosotros*. Three extralinguistic factors–proficiency, gender, and previous travel to Spain, affected *vosotros* production. Beginning learners utilized *vosotros* more than intermediate and advanced learners. Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) attributed this to the fact that *ustedes* formed part of the established interlanguage of the more proficient learners along with the emphasis on *ustedes* in U.S. Spanish language classrooms. The less proficient learners' interlanguage system may have been less established than the advanced learners, where one form might be preferred over another form in the informal second person plural context and therefore these beginning learners could more easily adapt to *vosotros*. Males utilized *vosotros* more than females. Participants who had previously traveled to Spain produced *vosotros* more than participants who had not experienced this travel. The participants in Ringer-Hilginger (2013) reported less comfort with *vosotros* as opposed to *ustedes* despite a desire to use *vosotros* while in Spain. They also conveyed uncertainty in knowing how to form the second person plural imperative, which was primarily equated with a lack of instruction on *vosotros* forms in US Spanish classrooms, however this uncertainty decreased over time.

Reynolds-Case (2013) investigated the development of the informal second person plural (*vosotros* or *ustedes*) by 10 intermediate and advanced learners studying in Madrid for four weeks. The participants responded in writing to five situations eliciting questions in the second person plural informal form. One week prior to departing, six uses of *vosotros*, out of 40, were produced by two of the ten students. One week after returning home from the four weeks abroad, *vosotros* was produced 26 times out of a possible 40 by 10 students, resulting in a 45.65% increase in *vosotros* production. Prior to studying abroad, only one participant produced *vosotros* when asking university students if they had the time and only two produced this variant when asking peers a question. After the four weeks abroad, all 10 participants produced *vosotros* in both of those situations.

While both of the previous studies that investigated the use of *vosotros* by learners of Spanish abroad reported increased use of the feature, the proficiency level of the learners differed. In Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) beginning learners favored the use of *vosotros*, while in Reynolds-Case (2013) all learners produced the feature at least twice and none were considered beginner learners. In addition, both studies elicited the feature in writing as opposed to in speech, like the current study. Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) was the only study to investigate the linguistic and extralinguistic features that affected the production of *vosotros*. The current study intends to expand on this knowledge by attempting to answer the question of whether learners studying abroad in North-Central Spain produce *vosotros* and what factors account for this production.

## 2. Theoretical Framework and Approach

Variation between two or more forms with the same meaning are divided into two categories (Rehner, 2002). The first type involves varying between a form that is native-like and a form that is considered an error and therefore not typically produced in native-like speech. This type of

variation is common in the speech of L2 learners. The second type involves varying between two forms that are both used by native speakers. The current study will examine this second type of variation in second language learners of the target language as they vary between *ustedes* and *vosotros* and all of their accompanying verbal and morphological forms.

According to Tarone (2007), the sociolinguistic variationist model of second language acquisition provides a framework for second language acquisition research and posits three causes for interlanguage variation. These include sociocultural factors, such as the purpose of the communication or identity; variation due to linguistic context, such as whether the form occurs in the present or past tense; and time. Forms learned later are not as automatic or internalized as forms learner earlier and as such these later learned forms require more attention and control (Preston, 1989). Regarding identity, under the poststructuralist theory, language is viewed as a social practice in which learners are constantly shaping their identities based on their past and present sociohistories, (Block 2007, Norton, 2010). Therefore, identity may play a key role in the adoption or rejection of regional features, particularly when learners were previously exposed to a variety of dialects of Spanish in the United States and who may not have spoken a distinguishable variety of Spanish. Increased production of *vosotros* could be a technique learners use to mark their identities as North Central Castilian Spanish language users.

Given these theoretical underpinnings, the first research question explores the second type of variation: How do learners' production of *vosotros,* and all of its verbal and morphological forms, change during a semester abroad in Spain? The second research question addresses the cause of these changes: What linguistic and extralinguistic factors account for *vosotros* production at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester?

## 3. Method

### 3.1. Participants and Program

The participants consisted of 24 majors and minors of Spanish studying abroad for one 13-week semester in Toledo. The six male and 18 female participants, all native-English speakers, were students at a variety of U.S. universities with 16 attending large public universities and eight attending small private colleges. Sixteen of the participants were in their third year of university studies, seven were in their fourth or fifth year, and one was in her second year at the time of the study. Their ages ranged from 18-21 with one exception of one student who was 31. All participants had completed intermediate university-level college Spanish courses, or the equivalent test, prior to studying abroad, while 21 had also completed advanced-level university Spanish coursework.

The program consisted of 70 students and was based in a centrally located building, which housed the dormitory, cafeteria, classrooms, lounges, television room, and gymnasium. Fourteen participants lived in the dormitory, and ten lived with local host families. Each family hosted only one student. Students were enrolled in three to five courses taught by instructors who spoke Castilian Spanish. Ten Puerto Rican and two Japanese students also participated in the program and enrolled in courses alongside the participants. Some classes included a service learning or internship component. To varying degrees, the participants interacted with locals outside of class assignments including voluntary conversation exchange partners, extracurricular activities, and volunteer opportunities.

### 3.2. Data Collection

Data were collected at the beginning (Week 1), middle (Week 6), and end (Week 12) of the semester. This included information about participants' Spanish-speaking social networks, based on Qui (2011), asking students to identify the five people they spoke Spanish with the most, how often they spoke with each person identified, and in what contexts. It also elicited information about how often and in what contexts participants spoke Spanish and English. This was based on the Language Contact Profile in Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz, and Halter (2004). This design was chosen to gather information about social networks and language contact, since it was not possible for the researcher to observe all participants' interactions directly, and the limitation is that students may not report this information accurately. Finally, the questionnaire also included 28 Likert-scale questions designed to ascertain information on participants' attitude toward Castilian Spanish and its people, integrative and instrumental motivation, desire to speak Castilian Spanish, awareness of Castilian Spanish, pronunciation anxiety, and distractors (See *Statements about Spanish* in Appendix A). The questionnaire utilized during Week 1 also elicited information about participants' previous experiences with Spanish, including instructors, courses, and travel abroad.

Within three days of completing the questionnaire at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester, the participants conversed with a university-educated local Spaniard, using a semi-structured interview format with questions provided by the researcher. These questions included topics such as descriptions of family members, roommates, favorite cities in the United States and Spain, work experiences, and previous vacations and trips. The native Spanish-speaker started the conversation with questions in the present tense, then past tense, hypothetical, and future. The purpose of this conversation was to elicit regional phonological features. The results of the phonological regional features were reported in George (2014). The native Spaniard was utilized instead of the non-native researcher, since Ringer-Hilfinger (2012) thought this could have influenced her results.

Immediately after conversing with the native speaker, participants were escorted to a quiet room where they were left alone to respond aloud in Spanish to prompts written in English, eliciting semi-spontaneous speech (see Appendix A for list of prompts). Participant's responses were recorded and transcribed. The prompts elicited six commands and five questions, in realistic situations. Because *vosotros* is typically used in Spain for the second person plural in informal situations whereas *ustedes* is used in formal situations, or to show respect to a group of individuals (Azofra Sierra, 2009), the prompts eliciting commands involved speaking to children, while the prompts eliciting questions involved speaking to a group of peers around the same age as the participants. There were also 14 distractors, which did not elicit a second person plural informal form. Four local native Castilian Spanish speakers also responded to the same prompts, serving as native speaker controls.

Previous research on L2 sociolinguistic variation has used a variety of tasks to elicit the informal second person plural forms in Spanish. Participants in Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) responded in writing to a picture task, while Reynolds-Case (2013) participants' responded in writing to five prompts written in English. Role plays were used to elicit oral data on the selection of the formal or informal second person pronoun in study abroad learners in France, Kinginger (2008), where participants responded out loud in their L2 French to prompts written in English. This is similar to the current study. Geeslin (2010) confirms that no single task can convey a complete picture of L2 language use and emphasizes the importance of using multiple tasks. The current study pro-

vides semi-spontaneous oral data adding to the written data previously provided by L2 Spanish studies investigating variation between *vosotros* and *ustedes*.

Within two days following the recording of the prompts, participants completed a semi-structured interview with the researcher in the language of their choice. This choice potentially aided in the participants' comfort as they responding to questions about their experiences while abroad and to identified their dialectal preference for their own speech and that of others on the same program.

### 3.3. Data Analysis

The frequency of *vosotros* production was calculated for each participant during Week 1, Week 6, and Week 12 and analyzed with SPSS. The prompts shown in bold in Appendix A were included in the analysis. These were chosen because three of the four native speakers utilized a form of *vosotros* in their responses. In addition to analyzing *vosotros*, the use of *ustedes* and *other* forms were analyzed to determine change throughout the semester. The *other* forms consisted of second person singular instead of second person plural (e.g., ***¿Quieres** solamente tapas o comida más grande?* (*Do you (singular) want only tapas or more food?*)), first person plural (e.g., ***Vamos** a cambiar nuestra actividad (We need to change our activity)*), first person singular (e.g., *Por favor estudiantes, todos chicos, **necesito** su atención para algunas[sic] más minutos.* (*Please students, all boys and girls, I need your attention for some more minutes*)) or other forms of commands such as *¡Silencio! (Silence!)*. The use of *vosotros* was analyzed in each of the two situations (commands and questions) to determine if there were any significant changes in *vosotros* production throughout the semester with each utterance function and to determine any effects of the utterance function on the production of *vosotros*.

The extralinguistic factors investigated were based on the questionnaires and interview with the researcher. Attitude toward Castilian Spanish, the desire to speak Castilian Spanish, and awareness of Castilian Spanish were averaged based on participant responses from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Using information from the background questionnaire, previous travel to Spain was determined and reported in weeks. Contact in Spanish was calculated at Week 1 based on the number of hours per week of spoken Spanish as reported on the questionnaire. During Week 6 and Week 12, the number of hours reported speaking or hearing Spanish divided by the number of hours reported speaking or hearing English as reported on the questionnaires to determine the ratio of Spanish to English contact. The strength of the Castilian Spanish social network was calculated based on the number of Castilian Spanish speakers as reported by each participant on the questionnaires as well as the amount of contact with each speaker. During the interview with the researcher, participants were asked: "Do you purposefully try to speak Castilian Spanish?". Those that responded affirmatively were divided against those that responded negatively to determine differences between the two groups in terms of *vosotros* production. Two additional groups were formed, those participants with a previous Castilian Spanish-speaking instructor and those without since this may have impacted *vosotros* production. Finally, the number of weekend trips taken both within and outside of Spain was also analyzed, based on the data provided by the participants on the questionnaires and confirmed in the interviews with the researcher.

My predictions for *vosotros* production are as follows: First, that students will increase their use of *vosotros* throughout the semester based on previous research with similar findings (Reynolds-Case 2013, Ringer-Hilfinger 2013). Second, that a more positive attitude toward Castilian

Spanish, a stronger desire to speak Castilian Spanish, more awareness of Castilian Spanish, more contact in Spanish or higher ratios of Spanish to English contact, and stronger Castilian Spanish social networks will lead to more *vosotros* production. Third, that participants who previously traveled to Spain will use *vosotros* more than those who did not. Those students who travel outside of Spain or to Andalusia in Southern Spain, where *vosotros* is not typically produced, will produce *vosotros* less than those who travel within Spain. Fourth, that participants with a preference for Castilian Spanish, participants who deliberately attempt to sound Castilian, and participants with previous Castilian Spanish-speaking instructors will employ *vosotros* more than the participants without these characteristics.

## 4. Results and Analysis

The percentage of *vosotros*, *ustedes* and other forms produced throughout the semester by L2 and native speakers is shown in Table 1. For *vosotros*, the repeated measures ANOVA measuring differences in the average percentage of *vosotros* produced at each point in the semester resulted in significant differences for the L2 participants, $f(2) = 4.711$, $p = .014$. The pairwise comparison revealed that the increase of 11.2% from Week 1 to Week 6 ($p = .081$) was approaching significance and the increase of 14.5% from Week 1 to Week 12 ($p = .003$) was significant. However, the 4% increase during the second half of the semester, from Week 6 to Week 12, was not significant ($p = .363$).

**Table 1.**
Second Person Plural Informal Production

| | **Week 1: L2 Speakers (N = 24)**<br>% (raw tokens)<br>(SD = Standard Deviation) | **Week 6: L2 Speakers (N = 24)**<br>% (raw tokens)<br>(SD = Standard Deviation) | **Week 12: L2 Speakers (N = 24)**<br>% (raw tokens)<br>(SD = Standard Deviation) | **Native Speakers (N = 4)**<br>% (raw tokens)<br>(SD = Standard Deviation) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Vosotros** | 11.28 (29/257)<br>(SD = 19.57) | 22.48 (58/258)<br>(SD = 28.61) | 25.78 (66/256)<br>(SD = 26.58) | 75 (33/44)<br>(SD = 15.52) |
| **Ustedes** | 41.34 (105/254)<br>(SD = 26.55) | 34.80 (87/250)<br>(SD = 30.31) | 24.00 (60/250)<br>(SD = 28.21) | 2.27 (1/44)<br>(SD = 4.55) |
| **Other** | 46.46 (118/254)<br>(SD = 21.88) | 40.80 (102/250)<br>(SD = 25.83) | 45.20 (113/250)<br>(SD = 28.86) | 22.73 (10/44)<br>(SD = 18.92) |

The use of *ustedes* by L2 speakers steadily decreased throughout the semester, but these decreases were not statistically significant as evidenced by the repeated measures ANOVA, $f(2) = 2.479$, $p = .095$. Within the *other* category, none of the differences in percentages by L2 speakers were significant ($f(2) = .497$, $p = .612$).

At Week 1, the repeated measures ANOVA resulted in significant differences between the use of *vosotros*, *ustedes*, and *other*, $f(2) = 9.925$, $p > .001$. The pairwise comparison revealed that this difference was between *vosotros* and *ustedes* ($p = .002$) and *vosotros* and *other* ($p > .001$). The participants used *vosotros* significantly less than other forms at Week 1. There were no significant

differences in Week 6, f(2) = 1.845, p = .170, nor Week 12, f(2) = 1.660, p = .201.

To measure differences in native speakers and L2 participants, nonparametric independent samples tests were run due to the low number of native speaker participants. The native speakers produced *vosotros* significantly more than the L2 speakers during Week 1 (p > .001), Week 6 (p = .003), and Week 12 (p = .002). Consequently, the native speakers produced *ustedes* significantly less than the L2 speakers during Week 1 (p = .009), Week 6 (p = .035), and Week 12 (p = .004). Native speakers did not differ significantly from L2 speakers during Week 1 (p = .070), Week 6 (p = .144) or Week 12 (p = .186) in terms of other forms produced. In this *other* category, the L2 participants tended to produce second person singular forms while the native Spanish speakers tended to produce first person plural forms.

The function of the utterance in which *vosotros* was elicited is relevant for the L2 participants. The first situation elicited primarily commands, while the second situation elicited primarily questions (see Appendix A for specific prompts). When employing *vosotros* in commands, participants increased their production in the first half of the semester and decreased slightly in the second half as shown in Table 2. The repeated measures ANOVA for commands was significant (f(2) = 5.644, p = .006. The increase by 14.48% from Week 1 to Week 6 was significant (p = .018) as well as the increase by 11.58% from Week 1 to Week 12 (p = .002), but the decrease by 2.90% from Week 6 to Week 12 was not significant (p = .632).

**Table 2.**
Vosotros Production by Utterance Function

| | **Week 1: L2 speakers % (raw tokens) (SD)** | **Week 6: L2 speakers % (raw tokens) (SD)** | **Week 12: L2 speakers % (raw tokens) (SD)** | **Native Speakers % (raw tokens) (SD)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Commands (N = 6)** | 1.46% (2/137) (5.20) | 15.94% (22/138) (26.88) | 13.04% (18/138) (17.01) | 62.50% (15/24) (31.55) |
| **Questions (N = 5)** | 22.50% (27/120) (33.00) | 30.00% (36/120) (40.00) | 40.68% (48/118) (40.68) | 90% (18/20) (11.55) |

When employing *vosotros* in questions, participants steadily increased their production throughout the semester as shown in Table 2. Despite these increases by 8% during the first half of the semester and 11% during the second half of the semester, the repeated measures ANOVA was only approaching significance F(2) = 2.96, p = .06, meaning that these increases are not statistically significant.

*Vosotros* was produced more in Questions than in Commands. The paired t-test resulted in significant differences during Week 1 t(23) = -2.96, p < .05 and Week 12 t(23) = -3.64, p < .01, but not Week 6 t(23) = -1.77, p = .09.

Despite the increases in *vosotros* production in commands and questions, native speakers produced *vosotros* significantly more than the L2 participants during all weeks in both questions and commands as evidenced by the Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U Test. This nonparametric test was used due to the small sample size of native speakers (Week 1 Commands p > .01, Week 6 Commands p = .01, Week 12 Commands p < .01, Week 1 Questions p < .01, Week 6 Questions p = .02, Week 12 Questions p = .02).

Individual variation in *vosotros* production is evident as well as the number of individuals who produced this variant throughout the semester as shown in Table 3. The number of participants who produced *vosotros* at least once increased by 17% throughout the semester, from 10 to 14 participants. Eight participants never produced *vosotros*. During the first half of the semester, nine participants increased their use of *vosotros*, two decreased, and one remained the same. During the second half of the semester, eight participants increased their use of *vosotros*, four decreased, and two stayed the same. From the beginning (Week 1) to the end (Week 12) of the semester, 12 participants increased their use of *vosotros*, one decreased, and two remained the same.

**Table 3.**
*Vosotros* Production in Percentages by L2 Participants

| Participant | Week 1 | Week 6 | Week 12 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| D | 0 | 36 | 45 |
| E | 0 | 100 | 64 |
| F | 36 | 45 | 55 |
| G | 36 | 60 | 40 |
| H | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| J | 45 | 45 | 45 |
| K | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| L | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| M | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| N | 60 | 40 | 80 |
| O | 9 | 0 | 55 |
| P | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Q | 9 | 55 | 55 |
| R | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| S | 9 | 36 | 9 |
| T | 0 | 64 | 36 |
| U | 30 | 36 | 45 |
| V | 0 | 36 | 0 |
| W | 45 | 36 | 55 |
| X | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Comments provided by participants during the interview illuminate individual variation as well as attitudes towards the use of this particular regional feature. One participant commented on her unfamiliarity with *vosotros* prior to arriving in Spain. She increased her use of *vosotros* from 0% at the beginning and middle of the semester to 40% at the end of the semester. She stated in her interview with the researcher:

> .... No me gusta usar...vosotros. Yo no sabía el forma de vosotros antes de llegar. Yo siempre uso ustedes y ahora cuando uso uds, yo siento estúpido. No me gusta usar ustedes, pero es la unica forma que yo sé. ... Solo sabía ustedes. Ahora yo trato de usar vosotros.

> [...I don't like to use...vosotros. I didn't know the vosotros form before arriving. I always use ustedes and now when I use ustedes, I feel stupid. I don't like to use ustedes, but it is the only form I know. I used to only use ustedes. Now I try to use vosotros.] (Participant P, exit interview, My translation)

Another participant stated in her interview at the end of the semester:

> ..the Spanish that I'm going to be using when I go home isn't going to be Castilian Spanish... They probably will understand me but they are going to be like why are you talking to me like that... and I know how to use if I need to use it. (Participant N, Exit Interview)

Despite this, she was able to increase her use of *vosotros* from 60% during Week 1 to 80% at Week 12, a rate slightly above the native speaker average. She decreased her use of *vosotros* mid semester to 40%, but demonstrated a 40% increase in the second half of the semester. The u-shaped curve of production is common in L2 speakers when learning new forms (Ellis, 1997) and new variable features (Geeslin et al. 2010). Another participant demonstrated a confluence of factors affecting her use of *vosotros*. She stated that "Last year it bothered me. Vosotros is pretentious. ..." (Participant S, Entrance Interview). Despite this, she was able to increase her use from 9% during Week 1 to 36% at Week 2. She decreased to 9% by Week 12, possibly due to the fact that she would be returning to the United States, where she preferred the use of *ustedes*. Another participant implied that he previously used *vosotros* by stating "Ahora estoy usando vosotros ahora y eso es muy extraño para mi." [Now I am using vosotros now and that is very strange for me.] (Participant K, Mid Semester Interview, My translation). Despite the fact that he said he used *vosotros* by Week 6, he did not produce this feature until the end of the semester. When asked if using *vosotros* was difficult for him, he responded that it was a slow process, implying less familiarity with the vosotros forms: "No no difícil pero que poco a poco porque yo voy a decir algo en vosotros y luego oh, ¿qué pasa? [sic]" [No, it's not hard, but little by little because I am going to say something in *vosotros* and the later, oh what happened] (Participant K, Mid Semester Interview, My translation). This could explain why he was unable to produce *vosotros* mid semester.

In order to further investigate quantitatively why some participants employed *vosotros* and others did not, t-tests were run to determine statistical differences between the extralinguistic factors shown in Table 4. Non-parametric t-tests were used due to the lack of normal distribution in the data required for parametric t-tests. Despite the stronger Castilian Spanish social networks, greater number of contact hours, greater awareness of Castilian Spanish and more previous travel to Spain in the 10 participants that utilized *vosotros*, no significant differences between the two groups were found during Week 1.

**Table 4.**
Extralinguistic Factors and use of *Vosotros* during Week 1

| | **Used vosotros (N = 10) (SD) / No vosotros (N = 14) (SD)** | **P-value for Non parametric t-test Mann-Whitney U** |
|---|---|---|
| **Castilian Social Network (0-10)** | 0.40 (0.42) / 0.14 (0.36) | 0.31 |
| **Contact (hours per week hearing or listening to Spanish)** | 4.10 (1.52) / 3.57 (1.55) | 0.44 |
| **Attitude (1-6)** | 4.48 (0.84) / 4.68 (0.85) | 0.51 |
| **Desire (1-6)** | 1.00 (0.32) / 1.12 (0.30) | 0.51 |
| **Awareness (1-6)** | 4.33 (1.25) / 4.10 (1.02) | 0.59 |
| **Previous Travel (weeks)** | 1.40 (1.90) / 0.21 (0.58) | 0.12 |

Although the 12 participants who produced *vosotros* exhibited more contact in Spanish, a stronger desire to speak Castilian Spanish, and more previous travel to Spain than the 12 participants who did not employ *vosotros*, differences among the two groups were not significant in Week 6 as shown in Table 5. Worth noting, is that the desire to speak Castilian Spanish increased for both groups, from very little desire during Week 1 to a slightly stronger desire at Week 6.

**Table 5.**
Extralinguistic Factors and use of *Vosotros* during Week 6

| | **Used vosotros (N = 12) (SD) / No vosotros (N = 12) (SD)** | **P-value for Non parametric t-test Mann-Whitney U** |
|---|---|---|
| **Castilian Social Network** | 3.25 (1.66) / 3.25 (1.48) | 1.00 |
| **Contact (Ratio Spanish to English)** | 3.65 (2.68) / 3.09 (1.94) | 0.84 |
| **Attitude (1-6)** | 4.52 (0.94) / 4.94 (0.69) | 0.32 |
| **Desire (1-6)** | 4.13 (0.91) / 3.71 (1.17) | 0.51 |
| **Awareness (1-6)** | 4.75 (0.59) / 4.97 (0.69) | 0.44 |
| **Previous Travel Spain (weeks)** | 1.25 (1.82) / 0.17 (0.39) | 0.22 |

The number of participant who produced *vosotros* increased by two from Week 6 to Week 12, for a total of 14 participants. Despite the greater number of contact hours in Spanish, stronger desire to speak Castilian Spanish, and more weeks of previous travel to Spain, the group that produced *vosotros* did not differ significantly than the group that did not employ *vosotros*, as shown in Table 6. However, those who produced *vosotros* participated in significantly fewer weekend trips outside of Spain, $f(2) = 5.53$, $p = .03$.

**Table 6.**
Extralinguistic Factors and use of *Vosotros* during Week 12

| | **Used vosotros (N = 14) (SD) / No vosotros (N = 10) (SD)** | **P-value for Non parametric t-test Mann-Whitney U** |
|---|---|---|
| **Castilian Social Network** | 3.35 (1.45) /3.50 (1.84) | 0.84 |
| **Contact (Ratio Spanish to English)** | 2.99 (1.57) / 1.94 (1.30) | 0.14 |
| **Attitude (1-6)** | 4.30 (0.90) / 4.78 (1.06) | 0.17 |
| **Desire (1-6)** | 4.04 (1.12) / 3.65 (1.09) | 0.29 |
| **Awareness (1-6)** | 4.93 (0.64) / 4.93 (0.59) | 0.93 |
| **Previous Travel Spain (weeks)** | 1.07 (1.73) / 0.20 (0.42) | 0.40 |
| **Trips Spain (#)** | 3.07 (1.38) / 3.30 (1.16) | 0.80 |
| **Trips Outside Spain (#)** | 1.57 (1.22) / 2.80 (1.32) | 0.03* |

* significant at the p > .05 level

Table 7 displays *vosotros* production throughout the semester by those participants who responded affirmatively to the researchers' question asking if they they attempted to sound like a Castilian Spanish-speaker in comparison to those participants who responded negatively. No significant differences between the two groups were found.

**Table 7.**
*Vosotros* Production and Attempting to Sound like a Castilian Spanish Speaker

| | **Attempt** (Week 1, N = 13) (Week 2, N = 15) (Week 3, N = 12) **Vosotros Production (SD)** | **No attempt** (Week 1, N = 11) (Week 2, N = 9) (Week 3, N = 12) **Vosotros Production (SD)** | **P-value for Non parametric independent samples Mann- Whitney U test** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Week 1** | 14.89% (19.98) | 10.41% (19.73) | 0.65 |
| **Week 6** | 26.06 (29.73) | 18.18 (27.65) | 0.68 |
| **Week 12** | 25.30 (25.62) | 28.94 (28.51) | 0.89 |

Table 8 shows differences among participants who were previously exposed to Castilian Spanish either via previous travel to North Central Spain or a previous Castilian Spanish-speaking instructor compared to those who did not receive this exposure.

**Table 8.**
*Vosotros* Production and Previous Exposure to Castilian Spanish

| | No Exposure (N = 10)<br><br>Vosotros Production (SD) | Some Exposure (N = 14)<br><br>Vosotros Production (SD) | Non parametric independent samples<br><br>Mann- Whitney U test |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Week 1** | 7.82% (18.72) | 16.43% (20.04) | 0.34 |
| **Week 6** | 19.46% (34.63) | 25.71% (24.51) | 0.47 |
| **Week 12** | 29.27% (32.37) | 25.58% (22.76) | 0.80 |

As expected, the participants with previous exposure produced *vosotros* more than participants without such exposure during Week 1 and Week 6. By the end of the semester, the participants with previous exposure to this variety of Spanish produced *vosotros* less than those without this exposure. However, none of these differences were statistically significant as evidenced by the Mann-U Whitney independent samples test.

Table 9 compares *vosotros* production in terms of living situation. Participants chose to reside either in the dormitory with other native English speakers or with a local host family. Living situation did not seem to affect *vosotros* production as no significant differences were found.

**Table 9.**
*Vosotros* Production and Living situation

| | Dormitory (N =13 )<br><br>Vosotros Production (SD) | Host Family (N = 11 )<br><br>Vosotros Production (SD) | Non parametric independent samples<br><br>Mann- Whitney U test |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Week 1** | 12.31% (22.38) | 13.47% (16.70) | 0.53 |
| **Week 6** | 21.96% (32.62) | 24.46% (25.55) | 0.73 |
| **Week 12** | 26.43% (31.11) | 27.93% (21.49) | 0.91 |

## 5. Discussion

The current study aligns with previous studies in that overall production of *vosotros* increases throughout the semester abroad, but individual variability is evident. The answer to the first research question about changes in *vosotros* production during a semester in Spain is that during the first half of the semester *vosotros* production increased in situations eliciting commands and questions. This increase continued in the second half of the semester in situations eliciting questions, but decreased in situations eliciting commands. The response to the second research question about the linguistic and extralinguistic factors related to *vosotros* production, is that *vosotros* is produced more in questions than in commands during Week 1 and Week 12. Those participants who produced *vosotros* traveled outside of Spain significantly less than those participants who did not produce *vosotros*.

The three main causes for interlanguage variation presented in Tarone's (2007) sociolinguistic model of second language acquisition – linguistic factors, extralinguistic factors, and time– can help explain the production of *vosotros* in this study. In terms of linguistic factors, the situations that elicited questions as opposed to commands resulted in more *vosotros* production. In comparison to other studies, all ten participants in Reynolds-Case (2013) produced *vosotros* in situations prompting them to ask questions to groups of people after studying abroad for only four weeks in Madrid. Two weeks prior to this sojourn, only two of the ten participants

produced *vosotros* a total of 15% (6/40), while one week after the program ended all ten participants produced *vosotros* for a total of 65% (26/40) (Reynolds-Case, 2013). In the current study, *vosotros* was produced much less at a similar point during Week 6, 30% (36/120), in prompts eliciting questions by 12 participants. However, *vosotros* was produced only 16% (22/138) in situations prompting commands in the current study during Week 6. When the task involved eliciting commands, *vosotros* production increased from 1% (2/137) in Week 1 to 13% (18/138) in Week 12 in the current study and from 11% (16/144) in Week 1 to 35% (50/144) in Week 14 in Ringer-Hilfinger (2013). This increase of 12% in *vosotros* production in commands in the current study is higher than the increase of 8% in questions but not as large as the 24% increase in commands found in Ringer-Hilfinger (2013). Therefore, the manner in which *vosotros* is elicited should be taken into consideration. The present study is consistent with previous studies in that *vosotros* production increased during the time spent abroad, with the exception of the non-significant decrease in in the second half of the semester in situations eliciting commands. The participants in Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) reported minimal confidence in their ability to form *vosotros* commands at the beginning of the semester, and increased confidence as their semester in Madrid progressed. The participants in the current study may not have known how to form the *vosotros* commands or were purposefully choosing *ustedes* over *vosotros*. Given that this decrease occurred at the end of the semester, it is likely that the participants chose *ustedes* because they knew it would be more socially acceptable with Spanish speakers in the United States, the majority of whom do not employ *vosotros* in their speech.

Regarding extralinguistic factors, the one factor found to be significant was the number of weekend trips taken outside of Spain. Students reported speaking more English on these trips and less Spanish, not only amongst themselves but also in service encounters. This decreased contact in Spanish could have resulted in less use of the regional variant under study and less time to cultivate relationships with locals. It could be beneficial, for those wishing to develop regional varieties of Spanish, to travel before or after the semester abroad.

Of more interest are the extralinguistic factors that were not statistically significant. No differences in *vosotros* production were found in participants who attempted to sound like Castilian Spanish speakers and those who did not, while both groups increased *vosotros* production from the beginning to end of the semester. Consciously deciding to utilize a specific variety of spoken Spanish did not impact the production of the regional feature under study, possibly due to other factors. Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) found a similar trend in her study with the majority of the participants (79% or 19/24) reporting a desire to use *vosotros*, but only 10 out of 21 participants actually employed it four months after returning home to the United States after spending 16 weeks in Madrid.

Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) found that previous travel to Spain was significant in terms of *vosotros* production. In the current study, although no significant differences in *vosotros* production were found between participants with and without prior exposure to Castilian Spanish, those with no prior exposure increased their use of *vosotros* from the beginning to the end of the semester more than those who had previous exposure. This demonstrates that prior exposure to the target variety is not needed to be able to develop *vosotros* and that such development will be greater for those without previous exposure since they begin with a lower frequency of use and have more room to increase.

Living situation had no effect on *vosotros* production, implying that participants will employ *vosotros*, whether they live in a dormitory with their classmates or with a host family. This could mean that other factors, such as the amount of travel to non-Castilian Spanish-speaking places,

are more important than the living situation.

The following factors were not significantly different between participants who produced *vosotros* and participants who produced *ustedes* or other forms: attitude toward Castilian Spanish, a desire to speak Castilian Spanish, and awareness of Castilian Spanish. Participants positively rated these factors on average between 3 and 5 out of 6 on the Likert scale. Despite the fact that contact with Spanish was higher in participants who employed *vosotros* compared to those who did not, no differences were found among the two groups. This is similar to Mendelson (2004) who found no relationship between oral proficiency and contact hours in Spanish in students studying abroad in Spain. The strength of the Castilian Spanish network remained about the same during the middle and end of the semester and was not significantly different between participants who employed *vosotros* and participants who did not. Again, this could be due to the self-reported nature of the data, which in this case did not reflect how often participants were exposed to groups of Spanish speakers, where the second person plural would be more likely to be utilized, as opposed to individual Spanish speakers, where the second person singular would be the more common choice.

The final cause of interlanguage variation is time, where earlier learned forms will become automatized, making later learned forms more difficult to acquire. This could explain why 33% (8/24) of the participants never produced *vosotros* and 13% (3/24) of the participants decreased their use of *vosotros* from the beginning to the end of the semester. Producing *ustedes* or another form, such as the second person singular, may have been more automatic for the L2 participants if they learned and acquired this form prior to learning or acquiring *vosotros*. Another explanation is that students were planning on returning to the United States where Latin American Spanish is more common. Despite a clear preference for *ustedes* either before or after study abroad, some participants were able to produce *vosotros* or increase their use of *vosotros* during their time abroad. In these cases, the learners may have been able to produce *vosotros* more automatically, while other participants may not have automatized the form. Other reasons, such as avoiding *vosotros* or preferring other varieties of Spanish which would not utilize *vosotros*, could have also caused participants to use *ustedes* or other forms.

## 6. Limitations, future directions, and implications

The current study has several limitations that should be addressed in future studies. First, *vosotros* was not elicited in spontaneous speech. Perhaps a role-play task could elicit such use. In addition, it is unclear if all of the participants knew how to conjugate verbs in the *vosotros* form. In the future, testing participants' knowledge of *vosotros* could shed light on participants' (non-) use of the feature. Additionally, since the extralinguistic factors were self-reported, gathering this data in a different format, such as direct observations or daily logs, may provide additional insight.

A future study could examine perception of this feature to verify comprehension. While, Ringer-Hilfinger (2013) investigated the use of *vosotros* by participants four months after they returned from their time abroad, her study was limited in terms of the number of participants, eliciting *vosotros* only in the imperative, and the lack of data on the desire to use the feature while the participants were still abroad. In addition, it could be beneficial to measure if intercultural competence has an effect on the use of regional features. As intercultural competence increases, does the use of local features? While no study to the author's knowledge has investigated the use of regional features in L2 Spanish and the degree of intercultural competence, most studies have

found that the use of regional features increases with more time spent abroad, yet most learners fail to reach the target-like norm of such usage (Geeslin, 2011).

This study offers implications for both teaching and study abroad programs. Even though participants were planning to return home to the United States where Castilian Spanish is not as common as other varieties of Spanish, 58% (14/24) produced *vosotros* during the final week of the semester (Week 12). This demonstrates that some participants will produce this form while others will not regardless of future plans. Such individual variation is common in the development of regional features (Geeslin, 2011.) The increase in *vosotros* use by 42% (10/24) of the participants in the first half of the semester was not statistically significant. Similarly, in the second half of the semester, 33% (8/24) of participants increased their use of *vosotros*, but again this increase was not significant. However, the increase in *vosotros* production from the beginning to the end of the semester by half of the participants (12/24) was significant. This provides evidence that semester long programs can be more effective than shorter programs in terms of developing this morphosyntactic regional feature, contrary to Reynolds-Case (2013) and in line with Ringer-Hilfinger (2013). Despite this significant increase in *vosotros* production after 12 weeks, half (12/24) of the participants significantly differed from native-like patterns, implying that more time abroad could lead to more use of this feature. In addition, explicit instruction of the forms may be needed for learners to feel more comfortable producing *vosotros* in its various forms and be able to produce it consistently. Another possibility is that those students who did not approach the norms were utilizing *ustedes* since they knew they would return home to this variant. *Ustedes* may have been more automatic for these participants, since the majority reported using *ustedes* prior to this semester abroad.

Sánchez Avedaño (2004) argues for the teaching of all salient features of a dialect instead of selectively choosing one feature from one dialect and another feature from a different dialect. Participants in the current study with no previous exposure to Castilian Spanish proved their unfamiliarity with *vosotros* both in terms of their production during Week 1 and their comments during their interview with the researcher. Teaching *vosotros* in the classroom, could lead to more successful integration of *vosotros*, particularly for those participants who were attempting to use this feature, but who did not reach target like norms by the end of the semester. Often times, foreign language textbooks either leave out regional features of the target language or include them only as footnotes (Sánchez Avedaño, 2004). Conley and Gallego (2013) found that beginning level U.S. university Spanish instructors mentioned *vosotros* but did not elaborate on its structure or use and only 26% of the instructors presented dialectal differences regularly. Arteaga and Llorente (2009) support the active instruction of *vosotros* for students in Spain and the passive instruction for Spanish learners in the United States, due to the fact that most Spanish-speakers in the United States are originally from Latin America. Not exposing students to a variety of dialects means limiting their exposure to the diversity that is the Spanish language (Sánchez Avedaño, 2004). This would be a detriment to U.S. students, especially since the majority have chosen to study abroad in Spain over Latin America.

Teaching students about the diversity of the Spanish language through its many varieties as well as about social and regional variation is beneficial to understanding the diversity of the Spanish language. It aligns with a critical pedagogical approach, which can "enhance not only students' language proficiency but also their cultural awareness" and empower students to decide which variety they wish to employ (Moreno-López, 2004, p. 82). Finally, it is representative of a sociolinguistically responsive pedagogy, where students learn what indexes the use of sociolinguistic features whether it is geographic origin, social distance, power, or another item (van

Compernolle 2010; van Comper- nolle & Kinginger 2013; van Compernolle & Williams 2012).

Study abroad programs could include some instruction on the use of common regional features of the target area of study. In addition to program directors and instructors addressing salient regional features with students, it could be beneficial for students to encounter these features on their own with locals from the study abroad community. This could be done by adding a focus on regional features to the awareness raising tasks mentioned in Goertler (2015). These tasks utilize activities in the handbook "Maximizing Study Abroad" and blog posts by students to reflect on their language learning while abroad. The nature of the tasks, which include making comparisons and short ethnographic research projects, encourage students to seek out and analyze interactions with locals in order to more fully understand the target language and culture. This indirect instruction coupled with explicit instruction as suggested by Arteaga and Llorente (2009), could facilitate more production of *vosotros* by those who desire to use it.

## 7. Conclusions

This study sheds light on the development of the regional morphosyntactic feature of the second person plural informal *vosotros* by adult L2 speakers of Spanish. Overall, the use of *vosotors* increased significantly from the beginning to the end of the semester, while the use of *ustedes* decreased. Individual variation was evident as eight participants never produced *vosotros*, 10 produced it from the start of the semester, 12 produced it after 6 weeks and 14 after 12 weeks. Only four participants aligned with native speaker norm usage of *vosotros*, one during the first week, two after 6 weeks and two after 12 weeks.

Time, utterance function (commands or questions), and weekend trips outside of Spain were significant in terms of *vosotros* production. *Vosotros* use in both commands and questions increased throughout the semester, however, the increase was only significant when the utterance function was a command. When comparing extralinguistic factors, the only significant difference occurred in weekend travel outside of Spain as measured during Week 12. Participants who produced *vosotros* traveled significantly less outside of Spain during the semester. Study abroad programs could encourage participants who want to adopt regional features to travel only in Spain where Castilian Spanish is spoken during the program and travel elsewhere before or after the program. No significant differences in the strength of Castilian Spanish social networks, contact in Castilian Spanish, desire to speak Castilian Spanish, attitude toward Castilian Spanish, awareness of Castilian Spanish, and previous travel to Spain were found between participants who employed *vosotros* and patricipants who produced *ustedes* or other forms. In conclusion, despite individual variation, some students significantly increased their use of the morphosyntactic second person plural informal regional feature as the result of a semester abroad.

## Works Cited

Arteaga, D. & L. Llorente (2009): *Spanish as an international language: Implications for teachers and learners*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Azofra Sierra, M. A. (2009). Morfosintaxis *histórica del español: de la teoría a la práctica,* Madrid: Uned, Cuadernos de la Uned.

Bachman (1990) *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Bayley, R. (2005). "Second Language Acquisition and Sociolinguistic Variation." *Intercultural Communication Studies* 14(2), 1-15.

Block, D. (2007). The rise of identity in SLA research: Post Firth and Wagner (1997). *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 863-876.

Freed, B., Dewey, D., Segalowitz, N., & Halter, R. (2004). The language contact profile. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 349–356.

Gallego, M, & Conley, R. (2013) Raising Dialectal Awareness in Spanish as a Foreign Language Courses. *CAUCE Revista Internacional de Filología, Comunicación y sus Didácticas*, 36-37, 135-158.

Geeslin, K. (2010). Beyond "naturalistic:" On the role of task characteristics and the importance of multiple elicitation methods. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics, 3*, 501–520.

Geeslin, K. (2011). "Variation in L2 Spanish: State of the Discipline." *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 4(2), 461-517.

Geeslin, K., & Gudmestad, A. (2008). "The Acquisition of Variation in Second Language Spanish: An agenda for Integrating Studies of the L2 Sound System." *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 137-157.

Geeslin, K., García-Amaya, L., Hasler-Barker, M., Henriksen, N. & Killam, J. (2010). The Development of Variation in Clitic Pronouns among Spanish L2 Learners in an Abroad Immersion Program. In C. Borgonovo, M. Español-Echevarría, & P. Prévost (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 12th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 246-259). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Geeslin, K., García-Amaya, L., Hasler-Barker, M., Henriksen, N. & Killam, J. (2012). The L2 Acquisition of Variable Perfective Past Time Reference in Spanish in an Overseas Immersion Setting. In K. Geeslin & M. Díaz-Campos (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 197-213) Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Geeslin, K., Fafulas, S., & Kanwit, M. (2013). Acquiring geographically-variable norms of use: The Case of the present perfect in Mexico and Spain. In C. Howe (Ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 15th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 205-220). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

George, A. (2014). Study Abroad in Central Spain: The Development of Regional Phonological Features. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(1) 97-114.

Goertler, S. (2015). Study abroad and technology: Friend or enemy? *FLTmag*. Retrieved from http://fltmag.com/study-abroad-and-technology/.

Hansen Edwards, J. G. (2008). Social Factors and Variation in Production in L2 Phonology. *Phonology and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 251-282). In J. G. Hansen Edwards & M. L. Zampini (Eds.), Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Henriksen, N., Geeslin, K. & Willis, E. (2010). The Development of L2 Spanish Intonation During a Study Abroad Immersion Program in Leon, Spain: global contours and final boundary movements. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 3(1), 113-162.

Institute of International Education. (1998-2015). International Students at All
Institutions, 1998-2015. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/opendoors.

Kanwit, M., & Solon, M. (2013). Acquiring Variation in Future-Time Expression Abroad in Valencia, Spain and Mérida, Mexico. In J. Cabrelli Amaro, G. Lord, A. de Prada Pérez, & J.E. Aaron (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics* Symposium (pp. 206-221). Somervillle, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *Modern Language Journal, 92,* 1–124.

Knouse, S. (2013). The Acquisition of Dialectal Phonemes in a Study Abroad Context: The Case of the Castilian Theta. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(4), 512-542.

Moreno-López, I. (2004). Critical Pedagogy in the Spanish Language Classroom: A Liberatory Process. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education* 8(1), 77-84.

Norton, B. (2010). Language and identity. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. MacKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 349-369). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Paige, M., Cohen, A., Kappler, B., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J.P. (2003). *Maximizing Study Abroad: A Students' Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use.* Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Qui, W. (2011). *Language adjustments of international students in the US: A social network analysis on the effects of language resources, language norm, and technology* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3434212)

Rasmussen, J., & Zampini, M. (2010). The Effects of Phonetics Training on the Intelligibility and Comprehensibility of Native Spanish Speech by Second
Language Learners. In John Levis & Kimberly LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (pp.38-52). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

Reynolds-Case, A. (2013). The Value of Short-Term Study Abroad: An Increase in Students' Cultural and Pragmatic Competency. *Foreign Language Annals* 46(2), 311-322.

Ringer-Hilfinger, K. (2012). Learner acquisition of dialect variation in a study abroad context: The case of the Spanish [θ]. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(3), 1–17.

Ringer-Hilfinger, K. (2013). *The acquisition of sociolinguistic variation by study abroad students: The case of American students in Madrid*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Albany.

Sanchez Avedaño, C. (2004). Variación Morfosintáctica y Enseñanza del Español Como Lengua Extranjera: Reflexiones de un Lingüista Metido a Profesor. *Filología y Lingüística*, 30(2), 131-154.

Salgado Robles, F. (2011). The Acquisition of Sociolinguistic Variation by Learners of Spanish in a Study Abroad Context. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Schmidt, L. (2009). The Effect of Dialect Familiarity via a Study Abroad Experience on L2 Comprehension of Spanish. In J. Collentine, M. García, B. Lafford, & F. Marcos Marín (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 143-154) Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Shively, R. (2011). L2 Pragmatic Development in Study Abroad: A Longitudinal Study of Spanish Service Encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1818–1835.

van Compernolle, R. A. (2010). Towards a Sociolinguistic Pedagogy: Teaching Second-person Address Forms in French. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 66: 445–463.

van Compernolle, R. A., & Kinginger, C. (2013). Promoting Metapragmatic Development through Assessment in the Zone of Proximal Development. *Language Teaching Research* 17, 282–302.

van Compernolle, R. A., & Williams, L. (2012). Reconceptualizing Sociolinguistic Competence as Mediated Action: Identity, Meaning making, Agency. *Modern Language Journal* 96, 234–250.

Whatley, M. (2013). The Acquisition of Past Tense Variation by L2 Learners of Spanish in an Abroad Context. In J. Cabrelli Amaro, G. Lord, A. de Prada Pérez, & J. Elana Aaron (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 190-205). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Willis, E., Geeslin, K., & Henriksen, N. (2009). The Acquisition of /θ/ by Study Abroad Learners in León, Spain. Paper presented at the *13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

## Appendix A
*Vosotros* Task

**Directions:** *Please read the following situations and then respond in Spanish as you would in real life.*

**Situation 1:** You are volunteering at a community center in Madrid, Spain. You are helping with the after school program where you must lead elementary school-aged children in various activities.

**1. When you walk into the community center the kids are all running around and you need them to sit down in a circle on the carpet so that you can start the days' activities. What would you say to the children in order to get them to stop running, be quiet, and sit down in a circle?**

**2. Now that the kids are quiet and sitting down in a circle you need to explain the directions of the first activity. In order to start they need to open their books and take out their pens. What would you say?**

3. One of the students, Manolo, asks you if he can go to the bathroom. How would you respond to him?

3a. One of the students asks you where Manolo went. What would you say to him?

4. You need to tell one of the students to pick up her pencils that are scattered around her area because it is time to move on to the next activity. What would you tell this student?

**5. You need to get the attention of all of the students in order to start the next activity. What would you say to them?**

6. One of the students asks a question about how the activity works. She wants to know what she will need. What do you tell her?

**7. Two of the students start arguing during the activity. You need to tell them to stop fighting and continue working on the activity. What do you say to them?**

8. Some of the parents arrive to pick up their children. How would you greet them?

9. One of the mothers asks you what you think of her student, who happens to be an excellent participant in all of the activities and who always listens to you. What would you tell her?

10. You invite the parents to join in on the last activity of the day. What would you say to invite them to join in?

**11. The students are being really loud and you are having trouble getting their attention. What do you say to them in order to get them to quiet down a bit?**

**12. You need to tell all of the kids to get their things together and get ready to leave since their parents are either here already or will be soon. What would you tell them?**

13. What do you say as the kids and their parents are leaving?

**Situation 2:** You are eating lunch in Central Spain with some new Spanish friends you made while staying in a hostel in Madrid. They are all from Northern Spain and are traveling around a bit while on vacation and once they found out you were studying in Central Spain they decided to visit you on their way to southern Spain.

1. Your new friends ask you what your plans are for the long weekend after your classes let out on Thursday. What would you say to them?
2. **You ask your new Spanish friends what they are going to do after eating lunch. What would you say to them?**
3. **You ask your friends what they are drinking, in order to help you decide. What do you say to them?**
4. The waiter comes over and asks what you would like to drink. What do you say to him?
5. You ask your friends if they are going to order a lot of food, or just a little, as in appetizers? What do you say to them?
6. The waiter comes over and asks what you would like to eat. What do you say to him?
7. **You ask your friends what their plans for the week are. What would you say to them?**
8. You see some teachers, originally from Madrid, from your school walk in and they also see you. What would you say to them?
9. **Two of your friends went out with you the night before, but you had to go home before they did. You ask them what they did the rest of the night and how late they got back to their hotel. What would you say?**
10. Your friends ask you how your morning classes went. What would you say to them?
11. **One of your friends from school comes up to you and greets you in Spanish. You then introduce you friend to your new Spanish friends and explain how you met them at the hostel in Madrid the previous weekend. What would you say to them? You are ready to leave, because your class starts soon. What do you say to your friends?**

***Statements about Spanish*** (Presented in random order. Distractors not shown.)

*Instructions: Please respond to the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).*

Attitude toward Castilian Spanish and its people

1. Toledo, Spain is a good place to study abroad.
2. Spaniards from Toledo are friendly.
3. I like the Spanish accent from Toledo.
4. The more I get to know the people from Toledo, the more I want to be fluent in their language.

Desire to speak Castilian Spanish

1. I would like to lose my current Spanish accent and sound more like someone from Toledo.

2. I like my current Spanish accent even if it doesn't sound like one from Toledo.
3. More accurate Toledo Spanish pronunciation will help me participate more in the local way of life.
4. More accurate pronunciation of the Toledo dialect will help me make more friends in the community.

Awareness of the Castilian Spanish dialect

1. Spaniards from Toledo speak differently than other Spaniards.
2. I can tell when someone is from Puerto Rico, versus when they are from somewhere near Toledo.
3. Spaniards from Toledo sound similar to Spanish speakers from Puerto Rico.
4. Spaniards from Toledo speak differently than Mexicans.