

DIALECTOLOGY IN A MULTILINGUAL NORTH AMERICA

Robert Bayley
University of California, Davis



American Dialect Society
Austin, Texas
January 7, 2017



Moving Beyond a Traditional Focus

- ADS has traditionally focused on English in North America, with some work on other languages, such as Pennsylvania and Texas German and Canadian French.
- The focus has resulted in many outstanding achievements, including of course the publication of DARE.
- However, as North America becomes increasingly multilingual, we need to broaden our focus to understand fully the language situation.
- U.S. Census Bureau, for example, reported in 2015 that more than 60 million people spoke a language other than English (LOTE) at home.

Speakers of a LOTE at home in selected states

State	Number of LOTE Speakers	% of Population 5+ who speak a LOTE
California	15,348,831	43.7
Texas	8,233,251	34.7
New Jersey	2,489,641	30.0
New York	5,487,050	29.9
Florida	4,944,791	27.4
Arizona	1,616,190	26.8
US	60,361,574	20.7

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2015

Speakers of a non-official language at home in selected Canadian provinces

Province	Number of non-official Speakers	% of population who speak non-off. lang
British Columbia	828,225	19.0
Ontario	2,355,190	18.5
Quebec	688,511	8.8
Canada	4,705,030	14.5

Source: Stats. Canada, 2011

A focus on minority language communities

- The 60+ million speakers of languages other than English in the U.S. and the 4.7+ million speakers of languages other than English or French in Canada provide rich opportunities for research on language and dialect contact.
- Moreover, such opportunities are not limited to studies of contact between a majority or official language and an immigrant languages.
- Rather, many minority language communities are sites not only of contact between the minority language and English, but also between the different varieties of the minority language that immigrants bring with them to North America.

Dialect contact in minority language communities

- Today, I want to discuss recent work on mixed dialect Latino communities.
- We'll look at some studies in New York, New Mexico, Houston, and San Antonio.
- However, although our focus is on what is happening with Spanish varieties spoken in the United States, it is clear that contact between different dialects of minority languages extends well beyond Spanish.
- Today, however, I'll focus on Spanish.
- The following slide shows the diversity of the origin of the Latino community in six states with large Hispanic populations.

Origin of the Latino population in selected states

State	Total Latino	Mex	CA	SA	Carib.	Other
CA	14,991	12,560	1,357	237	304	432
TX	10,405	9,049	577	166	264	349
FL	4,790	692	518	803	2,632	146
NY	3,668	503	415	595	1,989	167
IL	2,153	1,718	77	77	239	42
NJ	1,730	244	222	361	833	70

Notes: Numbers in thousands. CA = Central America; SA = South America; Other = not specified or mixed.

Source: Pew Hispanic Center, 2015

Dialectal diversity in Latino communities 1

- The data in the previous slide illustrate the diversity of the Latino population, diversity which has led to dialect contact that has been the focus of a number of different studies including:
 - Variation between null & overt pronouns by Cubans, Colombians, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans in NYC (Otheguy & Zentella 2012).
 - Variation in future expression by Colombians in NYC (Orozco 2007, 2015).
 - Variation in the use of *tuteo* and *voseo* and final velar nasals by Salvadorans in Houston (Hernández 2002, 2009).
 - Variation between null & overt pronouns by Puerto Ricans in San Antonio (Bayley et al. 2012).
 - Switching between Mexican and Puerto Rican Spanish by MexiRicans in Chicago (Potowski 2016)
 - Dialect erasure among Salvadorans in a Pentecostal church in Los Angeles (Ek 2005).

Dialectal diversity in Latino communities 2

In the remainder of this talk, drawing upon several recent studies as well as my own work in Mexican-descent communities, I'll present examples of dialect contact, including intra-Spanish contact, based on several different sociolinguistic variables:

1. variation in future expression (Colombians in NYC) (Orozco 2015)
2. use of periphrastic present and past tense verb forms (New Mexicans and Ecuadorians in NM & Ecuador) (Dumont & Wilson 2016)
3. *tuteo* and *voseo* (Salvadorans in Houston) (Hernández 2002)
4. variation between velar and non-velar final consonants (Salvadorans in Houston) (Hernández 2009)
5. variation between null and overt pronouns (Spanish monolingual and Spanish/English bilingual Mexican Americans in San Antonio) (Bayley et al., forthcoming)
6. null and overt pronoun variation by Puerto Ricans in San Antonio (Bayley et al. 2012)

Future expression and English contact 1

- The Spanish, the future can be expressed in three ways, two of which are congruent with English:
 1. Morphological future (MF), e.g. **Trabajaré** mañana (I'll work tomorrow).
 2. Simple present (SP), e.g. **Trabajo** mañana (I work tomorrow).
 3. Periphrastic future (PF), e.g. **Voy a trabajar** mañana (I'm going to work tomorrow).
- We might expect that dialects in close contact with English would make greater use of the simple present and periphrastic future than dialects spoken in Spanish monolingual communities.
- However, as numerous scholars have shown, the distribution of future forms varies greatly across the Spanish speaking world and the periphrastic future is gaining at the expense of the morphological future.
- Use of the periphrastic future ranges from 45% in Andalusia and 50% in Mexico City to more than 90% in Chile and the Dominican Republic (Orozco 2015).

Future expression and English contact 2

- Given the extent of variability in Spanish varieties and the general direction of change, we might also expect speakers of a relatively low periphrastic using dialect in contact with speakers of a “dominant” dialect with high periphrastic usage to move in the direction of greater use of the periphrastic forms.
- Further, the convergence of English influence and the influence of a high periphrastic usage dialect might well lead to very substantial increase in use of periphrastic forms by speakers of low periphrastic usage dialects.
- As the following slide shows, that is exactly what Orozco (2015) found among Colombians in New York City.

Future Expression in Colombian and Puerto Rican Spanish (%)

Variant	Colombian NYC	Colombian Barranquilla	Puerto Rican NYC	Puerto Rican San Juan
MF	7.2	18.2	4.1	7.4
SP	30.3	35.9	17.2	20.1
PF	62.5	45.9	78.7	72.5

Notes: MF, morphological future; SP, simple present used to indicate future action; PF, periphrastic future.

Although use of the morphological future is lower among both U.S. groups than among the Latin American groups, the decline is greater among NYC Colombians than among the NYC Puerto Ricans, as is the corresponding increase in use of the PF, which may be attributed to the convergent influences of English and Puerto Rican Spanish.

Synthetic and periphrastic verbs in New Mexico and Ecuador

The second example comes from Dumont & Wilson's (2016) study of the use of periphrastic and synthetic forms of the past and present tense by Spanish/English bilinguals in New Mexico and Spanish monolinguals in Ecuador.

Examples follow:

1. Simple present: *pero ahora ya no trabaja ahí* (but (he) doesn't work there any more).
2. Present progressive: *ya no está trabajando* (he isn't working any more).
3. Imperfect: *Y luego yo y ella pintábamos* (and then she and I painted).
4. Past progressive: *y que estábamos pintando las ...* (and that we were painting the...).

Hypotheses

- Among other hypotheses, Dumont & Wilson sought to test Silva-Corvalán's (1994) claim that language contact tends to result in greater use of periphrastic constructions.
- They also wished to test her claim that the rate of changes in progress will be accelerated in situations of language contact.
- Silva-Corvalán's suggestions would lead us to expect **greater** use of periphrastic constructions by bilinguals, particularly bilinguals whose education was in English, than by monolinguals who have no contact with English (and only minimal contact with Quechua in Dumont & Wilson's data)..
- However, although Dumont & Wilson did observe some weakening of constraints among the New Mexican speakers, as the following data show, the bilinguals used periphrastic constructions at a **lower** rate than their monolingual counterparts.

Distribution of past and present tense forms in New Mexican and Ecuadorian Spanish

	Past progressive		Imperfect		Total
NM	100	11%	848	89%	948
Ecuador	75	17%	374	83%	449

	Present progressive		Simple present		
NM	42	8%	475	92%	517
Ecuador	251	13%	1738	87%	1989

Source: Dumont & Wilson 2016, tables 2 & 3

Clearly contact with English has NOT resulted in an increase in the use of periphrastic forms by the bilingual New Mexicans examined by Dumont & Wilson.

Intra-Spanish dialect contact

- Thus far, we have looked at variables where one or more variants are congruent with English.
- However, there are a number of variables where there is no possibility of English influence, including lexical, grammatical, and phonological variables.
- As an example of lexical variation, Potowski & Matts (2008) describe a young Chicago MexiRican woman who was “caught out” while trying to accommodate to a Puerto Rican interlocutor. She used the common Mexican expression: *¿Mande?* (Excuse me, lit. command me). Her interlocutor commented: “You’re more Mexican than Puerto Rican.”

Grammatical and phonological variables

Spanish dialectologists have studied in detail a number of features that vary widely across the Spanish speaking world. These include:

1. Alternation of the 2nd person informal pronouns *tú* and *vos* (and associated verb conjugations, e.g. *tú eres* vs. *vos sos*).
2. Alternation of velar and non-velar nasal finals.
3. /s/ aspiration and deletion.

Studies of the Spanish spoken by immigrants from El Salvador provide convenient examples of intra-Spanish dialect contact and dialect shift.

Dialect shift in a minority immigrant community

- Salvadorans are the largest Central American immigrant community and many Salvadorans, like other people from Central America, live in areas where people of Mexican descent constitute the great majority of Spanish speakers.
- Traditionally, Salvadoran Spanish differs from most Mexican dialects in a variety of ways, many of which are not subject to the influence of English.
- For example, like Argentines, Salvadorans use *vos* instead of *tú* as the second person familiar pronoun, i.e. *voseo* instead of *tuteo*.
- Moreover, as several scholars have noted, Salvadoran Spanish final nasals vary between velar and non-velar forms (Hernández 2009; Hoffman 2004).
- José Esteban Hernández has studied both of these features (as well as others) among Salvadorans in Houston. The following slides illustrate the results.

Salvadorans in Houston: Use of *tuteo* and *voseo* in conversations with Salvadoran and Mexican Spanish speakers

	El Salvador		Houston, Age of Arrival 14+		Houston, Age of Arrival 3-11	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>tuteo</i>	19	11.9	240	94.5	38	100
<i>voseo</i>	142	88.2	14	5.5	--	0
total	161	100	254	100	38	100

Source; Hernández 2002, table 4.

Salvadorans in Houston and El Salvador: Use of velar and non-velar nasals

Location	Velar nasal		Non-velar nasal	
	%	N	%	N
San Sebastián, ES	23	97	77	333
Holly Springs, TX	14	114	86	847
Segundo Barrio, TX	3	13	97	463

Source: Hernández 2009, Table 4

Accommodating to a “dominant” minority variety

- Clearly, the Houston Salvadorans Hernández studied, like Salvadorans in California studied by Ek (2005) and Lavandenz (2005), have accommodated to the norms of the dominant Spanish speaking group in the region.
- Equally clearly, the differences shown between speakers in El Salvador and those in Houston do not arise from contact with English, but from contact with another Spanish dialect.

Subject Personal Pronoun (SPP) Variation

In Spanish, a subject personal pronoun may be realized overtly or as null, e.g.

1. *Entonces cuando yo/Ø llegué a Panamá, yo/Ø llegué a Panamá en el 87....* (Then when I arrived in Panama, I arrived in Panama in 87....)
2. *Yo/Ø he vivido en muchas partes.... Y como adulto yo/Ø he trabajado mucho con mexicanos.* (I've lived in many places. As an adult, I've worked a lot with Mexicans.)
3. *Sí nosotros/Ø hemos platicado de eso y nosotros/Ø queremos que aquí en casa sea el español.* (Yes we've talked about this and we want Spanish to be the language of the home.)

SPP Variation & English Influence 1

- Subject personal pronoun (SPP) variation has been extensively studied in many areas of the world, including U.S. Spanish, most notably in Otheguy & Zentella's (2012) study of speakers of six different national dialects in New York City.
- Otheguy & Zentella found that speakers who were born in New York exhibited a greater rate of overt SPP use than more recent arrivals, regardless of their national origin, a result that they attributed to greater exposure to English.
- Other studies, however, have found different results. Bayley & Pease Alvarez (1997) in a study of Mexican-descent children in northern California found no such increase and Flores-Ferrán (2004) in a study of NYC Puerto Ricans argued that the evidence for attributing an increase in the rate of SPP use to exposure to English was insufficient.

Disentangling dialect accommodation from English influence

- In his study of variability in forms of the future in Colombian Spanish in New York and Barranquilla, Orozco (2015) observes that the task of distinguishing between dialect accommodation and English influence is particularly challenging, especially when accommodation and English influence point in the same direction, e.g. greater use of the periphrastic instead of the morphological future or greater or lesser use of overt subject pronouns.
- However, consideration of speakers' social networks and linguistic backgrounds, along with the use of mixed models and comparisons of bilingual and monolingual speakers, enables us to tease apart Spanish dialect accommodation from English influence.
- I'll present evidence from some of my own work on personal subject pronoun variation to suggest how this may be done.

SPP Variation & English Influence 2

- Recently, I reanalyzed the SPP data from the San Antonio participants in Bayley, Greer, & Holland (2013).
- The data consist of 4,528 tokens, 2,802 from speakers who were monolingual in Spanish or strongly Spanish dominant and 1,726 tokens from speakers who were bilingual in English and Spanish.
- A contact hypothesis would predict a higher rate of SPP use by the bilingual speakers, the option that is congruent with English.
- However, that was not what happened. The bilingual speakers used overt SPPs at a rate that was only 2% higher than their more monolingual counterparts, a difference that failed to reach statistical significance ($p = 0.1487$).
- This result, along with results from Bayley & Pease-Alvarez and Flores-Ferrán, should caution us about attributing differences in contact varieties solely to English influence.

Null pronoun variation in Puerto Rican Spanish in South Texas

- A further example comes from variation between overt and null subject personal pronouns in the speech of Puerto Rican residents of San Antonio, who comprised only .3 percent of the city's population at the time of data collection and less than one percent of the Latino population.
- SPP variation marks a clear distinction between Caribbean varieties and what Otheguy and Zentella (2012) refer to as 'Mainland' varieties, i.e. the dialects spoken in most of Mexico, the Andean countries, etc.
- Overall, Caribbean speakers tend to use overt pronouns at a much higher rate than mainland speakers, including speakers from northern Mexico, the origin of most of the Spanish speaking population of San Antonio.

Data for the San Antonio Study

- Sociolinguistic interviews with ten Puerto Rican San Antonio residents who were interviewed by bilingual Texas graduate students. Interviews yielded 3,919 tokens of null or overt SPPs. Participants also completed extensive questionnaires about language use.
- Interviews with nine Mexican immigrant and Mexican American speakers conducted by bilingual Texas graduate students as part of a larger project on home language use among Mexican-background families in Texas and California (Schechter & Bayley 2002). These interviews yielded 1,739 tokens.
- Speakers' social characteristics are summarized the the following slides. Note that the one Puerto Rican speaker, Maritza, who had only lived in San Antonio for a year, was a long time resident of the southwest.

Puerto Rican Spanish Speakers: Social Characteristics and Language Use

Pseudonym	Sex	Age	Born	Years SA	Network	Lang use work	Lang use home
Nora	f	35	PR	9	PR	≈	+
David	m	28	PR	2	PR	≈	+
Gustavo	m	51	PR	8	PR	+	+
Lilian	f	42	PR	6	PR	≈	+
Mari	f	56	NY	18	PR	+	+
Nina	f	38	NY	6	PR	+	+
Fonz	m	28	NY	7	PR	+	+
Juan	m	55	PR	17	Mex	+	+
Maritza	f	50	PR	1	Mex	–	–
Raúl	m	45	PR	16	Mex	+	+

Note: For Spanish use, +.61-100%; ≈, 41-60%; –, 0-40%.

Characteristics of Mexican-descent Spanish speakers

Pseudonym	Gender	Age	Occupation	Birthplace
María Gómez	f	35	Cafeteria worker	Coahuila
Alicia Sotomayor	f	40	Homemaker	Tamaulipas
Ruben Sotomayor	m	41	Construction worker	Tamaulipas
Rosa Iturbide	f	46	Clerk	San Antonio
Robert Reyes	m	38	Ranch worker	Coahuila
Alicia Alarcón	f	30	Homemaker, student	Coahuila
Lisa González	f	39	Homemaker	Coahuila
Ernesto Gómez	m	12	Student	Coahuila
Anita Trujillo	f	33	Reservations agent	San Antonio

Results

- Overall, results of multivariate analysis showed that both groups are subject to the constraints that have been found in other studies, i.e. co-reference, person/number, etc.
- The most important result for the present discussion concerns the effect of social network. Speakers whose Spanish-speaking social networks consisted primarily of Mexican Spanish speakers approximated the rate of pronoun usage found for the Mexican background speakers.
- Speakers whose Spanish speaking social networks consisted primarily of other Puerto Ricans used overt pronouns at the same rate (45%) as reported in studies of Puerto Rican Spanish in San Juan (Cameron 1992) and NYC (Flores-Ferrán 2004).

Use of Overt SPPs in Puerto Rican & Mexican American Spanish

Variety	% Overt Pro
Caribbean newcomers to New York City (Otheguy et al 2007)	36
Caribbean long-term residents in NYC (Otheguy et al 2007)	42
San Juan (Cameron 1992)	45
New York City Puerto Rican (Flores-Ferrán 2004)	45
San Antonio Puerto Ricans (Puerto Rican network)	45
San Antonio Puerto Ricans (Mexican network)	23
San Antonio Mexican-background speakers	27
Los Angeles Mexican immigrant & Chicano adults (Silva-Corvalán 1994)	28
N. California Mexican immigrant & Chicano children (Bayley & Pease-Alvarez 1997)	20

Conclusions

- As the studies discussed here show, in mixed dialect language minority communities, many influences are at work in addition to the influence of the majority language.
- These include speakers' social networks, the relative prestige of the variety of the minority language, the overall demographic characteristics of the minority language community and speaker agency.
- Recent work on language contact that considers lateral contact among different minority language dialects enables us to gain a fuller picture of the linguistic ecology of immigrant and language minority communities and, as Potowski (2016) has shown in her work on MexiRicans in Chicago, even of immigrant families where parents speak different varieties.

Selected references 1

- Bayley, R., Cárdenas, N. L., Treviño Schouten, B, & Vélez Salas, C. M. 2012. Spanish dialect contact in San Antonio, Texas: An exploratory study. In K. Geeslin & M. Díaz-Campos (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 48-60. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- ———, Greer, K., & Holland, C. 2013. Lexical frequency and morphosyntactic variation: A test of a linguistic hypothesis. *UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics* 19(2): Article 4.
- ———, Pease-Alvarez, R. 1997. Null pronoun variation in Mexican-descent children's narrative discourse. *Language Variation and Change* 9: 349–371.
- Cameron, R. 1992. Pronominal and null subject variation in Spanish: Constraints, dialects, and functional compensation. PhD diss., U. of Pennsylvania.
- Dumont, J., & Wilson, D. V. 2016. Using the variationist comparative method to examine the role of language contact in synthetic and periphrastic verbs in Spanish. *Spanish in Context* 13: 394–419.
- Ek, L. 2005. Staying on God's path: Socializing Latino immigrant families in South Central Los Angeles. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength*, 77–92. New York: Teachers College Press.

Selected references 2

- Flores-Ferrán, N. 2004. Spanish subject pronoun use in New York City Puerto Ricans: Can we rest the case of language contact? *Language Variation and Change* 16: 49–73.
- Hernández, J. E. 2002. Accommodation in a dialect contact situation. *Filología y Lingüística* 28(2), 93–110.
- ———. 2009. Measuring rates of word final nasal velarization: The effect of dialect contact on in-group and out-group exchanges. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13: 583–612.
- Orozco, R. 2015. Castilian in New York City: What can we learn from the future? In S. Sassarego & M. González-Rivera (Eds.), *New perspectives on Hispanic contact linguistics in the Americas*, 347-372. Madrid: Iberoamericana Verveurt.
- Otheguy, R., & Zentella, A. C. 2012. *Spanish in New York*. Oxford: OUP.
- ———, ———, & Livert, D. 2007. Language and dialect contact in Spanish in New York: Toward the formation of a speech community. *Language* 83: 770–802.
- Potowski, K. 2016. *IntraLatino language and identity: MexiRican Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- ———, & Matts, J. 2008. MexiRicans: Interethnic language and identity. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 7: 137–160.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. 1994. *Languages in contact: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford U. Press.