A SOCIOLINGUISTIC VIEW OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN SPEECH COMMUNITY:
A Review of the Literature

Susan Berk-Seligson
University of Arizona

Sociolinguistics, itself a relatively young field of scholarly endeavor, more and more has been reflecting an interest in Mexican Americans insofar as they, like blacks and American Indians, constitute a distinct linguistic-social group that is grappling with the problems common to poor ethnic minorities in the United States. This paper intends to survey the literature existing to date on the Chicano speech community as viewed from a sociocultural vantage point.

GENERAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS PERTINENT TO THE CASE OF MEXICAN AMERICANS

In a theoretical article dealing with communication in multilingual societies, Gumperz (1974) touches on a point that is the source of much debate in the literature on Mexican-American sociolinguistics, namely, what is the linguistic status of the speech varieties spoken by bilingual Mexican Americans. Gumperz notes (p. 101) that, "Since the classification of speech varieties as belonging to the same or different languages is in fact determined largely on sociopolitical grounds, it can easily be shown that the purely qualitative distinction between monolingualism and bilingualism is by no means adequate" for deciding the status of any two speech varieties spoken by a given stable multilingual society where "populations of widely different cultural and linguistic backgrounds live in close geographic proximity." And even when there are obvious grammatical differences between two speech varieties, if they are in contact over a sufficiently long period of time, convergence will result, materially affecting the distinctness between the two (i.e., there will result overlaps in lexicon, phonology, morphology, and syntax).

However, not all varieties of a language undergo the same degree of convergence. For two languages that coexist in a stable multilingual

65

society, casual styles tend to be less distant than more formal styles. Gumperz concludes with the supposition that "whenever two or more languages are regularly employed within the same social system, they differ significantly from the same languages as spoken in separate social systems. They are grammatically more similar and at the same time show greater intralanguage differentiation. Language distance is not a constant but varies with the intensity and quality of internal communication" (p. 102). Furthermore, he criticizes the traditional measures of language distance, such as "interference," arguing that they do not work in cases of stable bilingualism. Gumperz reasons that to posit the presence of interference is to assume that speakers know the structure of the standard, have direct access to it, and try to imitate it. The notion of interference, he considers, is a useful one for the analysis of linguistic borrowing and its effects on linguistic change, but it fails in the face of stable bilingual communities, "since members there interact largely with other bilinguals, and it can be shown that such interaction generates its own norms of correctness" (p. 103). In effect, he opts for discarding the a priori assumption that two languages are distinct, and for starting with the opposite view of treating them as part of a single whole, namely, the same linguistic repertoire.

Another theoretical issue relevant to the literature that has been produced on Mexican-American sociolinguistics is that of language as a fixed code and linguistic competence as a fixed attribute of a speaker (be he monolingual or bilingual). Mackey (1970), for instance, blames the Saussurian distinction between synchronic and diachronic[1] for the notion that at any one point in time a linguistic code can be fixed. This "synchronic fallacy" has a bearing on the description of the codes of bilinguals: it gives the impression of either interference or a high degree of free-variation, both of which "are illusions conditioned by the postulate that we are dealing with one or two synchronic codes" (1970, p. 197). It is thus assumed, fallaciously, that a fixed code or norm leads us "up a blind alley," in which it is impossible to distinguish between integration (borrowing) and interference, and difficult to determine at what point interference in the code is no longer interference (i.e., at what point a linguistic structure becomes part of the language). In order to solve the problem of separating the bilingual's codes, Mackey proposes three measures: (1) "availability": asking the bilingual what items each code contains; (2) "acceptability": asking him to separate items according to the code to which they belong; and (3) "translatability": asking him to transfer items from one code to the other.

Haugen (1970), revising some of his previously formulated notions, challenges the concept of fixed competence, proposing in its place

the notion of "variable competence" as the more adequate description of the codes of bilinguals. Haugen discards the applicability of transformationalist concepts such as "ideal speaker-hearer" and "homogeneous speech community" in the light of bilingualism, and finds that because the bilingual lives in a nonhomogeneous speech community, and usually is not an ideal speaker, the structure of bilingual codes is more accurately to be considered nonunique and variable.

Turning now to general pieces on the sociolinguistics of Mexican-American speech varieties, we find the most accurate, and frequently mentioned observation: the Southwest (the site of the vast majority of Mexican Americans) is characterized by extreme linguistic diversity, embodying several types of fairly complex contact situations (Ornstein 1972, p. 76). Ornstein (1972) isolates a number of languages ("standard" [Mexican] Spanish, Indian, Arabic, several European immigrant tongues such as Czech, Polish, German, and Basque, and "standard" American English), dialects (General Southwest Spanish, Northern New Mexico-Southern Colorado Spanish, Lubbock-Amarillo Texan English, and Southwest English [predominantly Southern Midland]), contact vernaculars (Spanish-Indian, Spanish-Indian-English, and Spanish-English), and special codes, such as jargons and *calós* (Pachuco, occupational Spanish, teenage Spanish, underworld Spanish, underworld English, and teenage English). He also points to the illuminating and provocative work of others. For example, he cites Lance's (1969) study of Texas Mexican Americans, which concludes that despite popular views regarding their communicative deficiencies, they demonstrate a " 'highly versatile linguistic competence encompassing a dialect of English, a dialect of Spanish, and the ability to use a mixture of the two when the social situation is ambiguous as to the choice of language or dialect for etiquette purposes' " (Lance 1969 in Ornstein 1972, p. 83). In addition, citing Labov, whose view is consistent with those of Haugen and Gumperz previously mentioned, Ornstein (1972, p. 84) espouses a theory of bilingualism that rejects the notion of bilingual codes being not fully structured systems (e.g., "hybridized," "pidginized" or "bastardized" forms). Bilingualism, instead of being considered as the alternation of two separate systems, each bound by strict co-occurrence rules, should be seen as alternating languages, or dialects, which function as subsystems of a single repertoire or over-all system.

In a broad, well-reasoned article on "Sociolinguistic Theory and the Chicano Community," Peñalosa (1975b) sharply attacks current sociolinguistic theory for its normative biases. He acuses sociolinguistics of preferring the consensus model over the model of power relationship, of focusing on the microlevel rather than the macrolevel, and of promot-

ing the ideology of development. All of these stances, he feels, work against the cause of Chicanos who are dedicated to the preservation of their language and culture and who reject any assimilationist policies levelled toward them by governmental institutions. He bemoans the fact that, "no U.S. social scientist with a Marxist or other conflict theoretical orientation has yet ventured into sociolinguistics or the sociology of language" (p. 4), and takes the area of language standardization as a case in point where a consensus rather than a conflict model of society underlies sociolinguistic work. In a similar vein, he points to the fact that language planning agencies in the U.S. are Anglo-controlled. The latter observation is typical of the current of resentment evident in the literature on Mexican-American sociolinguistics by Chicano academics who find that the field which they call their own is dominated by Anglo researchers. Finally, Peñalosa addresses himself to the classification of Mexican-American speech varieties. He considers the debate over whether the use of Spanish and English features within the same sentence is a matter of interference, code-switching, or a hybrid code to be a senseless one. Once again, following along the line of Labov, Gumperz, Lance, and Ornstein, Peñalosa regards the issue to be not one of either-or, but of variable systems. Thus, he accepts the possibility of all the aforementioned phenomena being present. And once again, tying his point to ideological factors, he accuses those who opt for the distinctive, discrete code interpretation of being ideologically motivated, and interprets such a stance as one more way to deny Chicanos their linguistic, and hence cultural, uniqueness (p. 3).

Another general article on Mexican-American sociolinguistics is Ornstein (1974), which comménts on the scarcity of "bona fide" sociolinguistic research carried out on Mexican-American speech, particularly in contrast to the relatively great number of studies that have been done on black inner-city speech. He attributes this situation to factors such as the passivity of Mexican Americans as a sociocultural group and their generally low profile as a minority. His aim, then, is to dispel the notion that Mexican-American speech varieties are not being studied at all, and he brings to light a wide range of sociolinguistic studies on Southwest bilingualism that are currently being carried out at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). The sociolinguistic studies program at UTEP has devised a sociolinguistic background questionnaire consisting of demographic items, attitudinal questions dealing with outlooks on English versus Spanish, Anglo versus Mexican-American culture, language loyalty and maintenance, self-evaluation of relative control of English and Spanish, and relative use of each language in various domains (home, friends, school, church and work). The questionnaire also

68

contains an elicitation component of oral speech, as well as of written
language. The aims of the questionnaire are to (1) discover the percep-
tions of the bilingual-bicultural population at UTEP, comparing them
with those of students enrolled at ethnically homogeneous institutions;
(2) determine the environmental perceptions of Mexican Americans and
Anglos at UTEP; and (3) compare environmental perceptions of Mexican
Americans who report assimilation problems with those who do not
(Ornstein 1974, pp. 97–98).

MEXICAN-AMERICAN CULTURE AND SOCIETY

Perhaps the most agreed-upon statement regarding Mexican-American
culture is that it is heterogeneous. Burma (1970a), for example, intro-
duces his anthology with the warning that although the book deals with
Mexican Americans, the group which is known by this name is "quite
heterogeneous, little unified, and is described and evaluated differently
by differing segments of the Anglo population" (p. xiii). Similarly, Peña-
losa (1970, p. 41) emphatically points out that, "Existentially there is no
Mexican-American culture. The group is fragmentized socially, cultur-
ally, ideologically, and organizationally. It is characterized by extremely
important social-class, regional, and rural-urban differences." Echoing
this point, and basing their findings on their analysis of census data,
household sample surveys of Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles and
San Antonio, informal interviews throughout the Southwest, and schol-
arly literature, Grebler et al. (1970) are struck by the exceptional internal
diversity within the Mexican-American people. They find intragroup
variation along the lines of immigrant versus native status[2] as well as
along geographic lines.[3] Furthermore, the condition of Mexican Ameri-
cans varies according to the particular city they live in.[4] Burma's (1970b)
findings are consistent with those of Grebler et al.:

The "Latins" of South Texas are largely rural, close to the Mexican culture in
many ways, and their single largest occupation is agricultural labor. The "Mexi-
can Americans" of East Los Angeles are highly urban, close to the Anglo culture,
and agricultural labor is wholly insignificant as an occupation for them. The
"Spanish Americans" of New Mexico and southern Colorado are different from
either. Although increasingly urbanized, their heritage is heavily rural, and they
have had relatively little contact with Mexico since 1800. They have a much
higher proportion of owners of agricultural land than either of the other groups.
At least on the county level they hold a large number of political offices, probably
a higher raw number than the California or the Texas group, although out-
numbered fifteen to one by either of them. (P. 3)

The reason for the variation by geographic area is a direct result of
Spanish settlement patterns in the Southwest. Christian and Christian

(1966) explain that the three separate areas of the Southwest (New Mexico, Texas, and California) were colonized at different times, and that "all have survived as identifiable entities, and have remained almost totally independent of one another" (p. 281). New Mexico, which was settled in the form of small neighboring agricultural communities, was populated by Spaniards who came directly from Spain. Their descendants preserved a generally illiterate, medieval folk culture. In the Arizona-California area, in contrast, Spain's cultural influence was not as lasting. The authors attribute the Spanish influence in this area to such factors as "the nostalgic and romantic Anglo emphasis on the Spanish heritage (plus its box-office appeal), and, more importantly, the relatively recent arrival in these areas of large numbers of people from Mexico" (p. 283). Compared to the early Spanish settlers of New Mexico, those of California were generally more influential, better educated, and economically better off.

The Spanish colonization of Texas, which occurred a century after that of New Mexico, stands in marked contrast to that of the other two regions. Texas was settled by Spaniards who were sent there by force, from the Canary Islands, since few Spaniards voluntarily chose to go there. The Texas region later became the site of penal colonies, which were created for the purpose of strengthening its defenses. The residents of the few settlements that were founded (in the San Antonio area) soon lost much of their loyalty to their government, because of the latter's neglect of them, and consequently began the illegal practice of trading with foreigners. As Christian and Christian point out, "Though the Spanish Texans could scarcely be said to have welcomed the Americans with open arms, they never united against them" (p. 285). An additional factor that served to differentiate Texas from both the New Mexico and Arizona-California provinces is that it was never as isolated from foreign influences. Texas shares with California the historical factor of relatively late settlement, which has prevented both areas from developing a characteristic subculture, as was the case in New Mexico, and which has been responsible for the submergence of Spanish language and culture under the pressure of Anglo influence.

Despite the general emphasis on diversity, some have argued common themes. Grebler et al. (1970, p. 37), for example, find a commonality in the historical patterns of work and settlement that set off Mexican immigrants from European immigrants to the United States. In general, these patterns tended to isolate Mexican Americans from the larger society. This isolation was manifested by settlement in rural areas or isolated towns, work that was seasonal or migratory in nature, and the movement of Mexican Americans in ethnically homogeneous groups

70

in the form of either family groups or male labor gangs. In contrast, European immigrants usually settled in cities and entered industrial occupations, these two factors causing them to have greater contact with the larger society, better economic opportunities, a greater possibility to organize labor groups, more regular schooling for their children, and greater access to the political system.

Grebler et al. (p. 320) provide insightful material on historical and contemporary aspects of Mexican-American social class and social mobility. Before the arrival of the Anglos, the Mexican enclaves of the Southwest were characterized by an elaborate and rigid caste system, whose basis lay in elitism and "purity of blood." They blame this system for restricting the social mobility of the descendants of those original immigrants. As in Mexico, the class structure was such that, "Spaniards outranked native-born Mexicans of Spanish descent, who in turn outranked *mestizos*, or mixed-bloods, who in turn outranked Indians" (p. 320). Under Anglo domination, the Spanish-Mexican class hierarchy was headed by a white Spanish group (e.g., San Antonio's Canary Island descendents, who claimed nobility), which was as hostile to the Mexican Indians and the mestizos as were the Anglos. For this reason, upwardly mobile Mexican Americans preferred to call themselves "Spanish" in those areas where "Mexicans" were regarded as untouchable (p. 322). Mexicanness carried with it a stigma. Those who belonged to the Mexican caste were differentiated by Mexicans and Anglos alike, and even when there was no "old family" in a given city, educated "Spaniards" were afforded social equality, whereas "Mexicans" were not.

In contemporary Mexican-American society, Grebler et al. (1970, p. 324) find income is the single major indicator of social class. As for lifetime social mobility, based on their comparison of two major urban centers, Los Angeles and San Antonio, as well as nonurban areas of the Southwest, they conclude (p. 340) that although the current economic status of Mexican Americans in Los Angeles is undoubtedly related to point of origin, especially at the extreme ends (those born in Mexico are overrepresented in the low-income categories, while those born in Los Angeles are overrepresented in the higher-income categories), this is much less true of San Antonio. In most other areas of the Southwest, birth or upbringing does not seem to be related to present income level. As for the distinguishing characteristics of Mexican-American culture, we may conclude from the writings of several experts (Burma 1970a, Peñalosa 1970, Rubel 1970, Grebler et al. 1970) that Mexican Americans have been characterized typically by extreme familism, present orientation, *machismo*, and *compadrazgo*. These have been considered by social

71

scientists to hamper the chances of Mexican-American upward social mobility within the larger Anglo culture. However, Peñalosa and Grebler et al. stress that these traditional cultural patterns are weakening in force, particularly as Mexican Americans became more and more urbanized.

The traditional pattern of extreme familism is best described by anthropologist A. Rubel (1970). In his study of a Texas town located a few miles from the Mexican border, Rubel finds the society comprising "a number of bilaterally oriented small families, to which individuals acknowledge their only binding allegiance. The strength with which a person is bound to his family so overshadows all other bonds in importance that it contributes to the atomistic nature of the neighborhood. Socially, if not spatially, each household stands alone, separated from others" (p. 211). Within the family, the most important social unit is the nuclear family, which consists of parents and their children. In audition, of particular social importance to the individual are his parents' brothers and sisters, above all one's mother's sisters. Overlaying this set of important social relationships is respect for one's elders, "a major organizing principle of the Mexican-American family" (p. 212).

While Rubel's characterization of a small Mexican-American border community may be accurate in its portrayal of traditional familism, Burma (1972a, p. 209) says such a description is not valid for urban Mexican-American communities (e.g., San Antonio, Denver, Kansas City, Omaha, Los Angeles). Peñalosa (1970, p. 48), too, referring to Southern California, talks of "the breakdown of traditional Mexican family structure," and Grebler et al. (1970, p. 354), find that "relationships within the extended kinship group among Mexican Americans have declined in importance with increased urbanization, acculturation, and contact with the dominant system."

Another characteristic often attributed to Mexican-American culture is "an orientation toward the present, with little practical concern for the future or the 'deferred gratification pattern'" (Burma 1970c, p. 22). This trait is closely related to fatalism, or a sense of predestation, which leads the individual to the conclusion that ambition is useless, since it usually does not achieve for him what he wants. This present-orientation is seen by some to be changing to future-orientation. Peñalosa (1970, p. 48), for one, sees Southern California Mexican Americans moving "away from traditional Mexican values of achievement, activity, efficiency, and emphasis on the future."

Machismo, or the cultural ideal of masculinity, combines with the patriarchal structure of the family to yield a husband and father who, in traditional Mexican-American families, is expected to dominate the

72

household. According to Rubel (1970, p. 213), the father "manages all the social affairs engaged in by members of the family, as well as all financial matters." In contrast, a wife and mother, ideally, is submissive and unworldly (p. 214). According to Grebler et al. (1970, p. 351), however, machismo is weakening in force: "Our data suggest that though the Mexican-American man may still refuse to wash dishes, in the more important aspects of the husband-wife and father-child relationship he is willing to admit that he has ceded control; at the same time he has assumed some of the responsibilities that are traditionally 'feminine.'"

Finally, another predominant feature of Mexican-American culture is compadrazgo, a form of ritual kinship that ties the parents of a child to the child's godparents. It is a relationship in which the *compadres* treat one another with respect and deference, and in which the godparents (*padrinos*) have certain material obligations toward their godchild (e.g., in the case of a baptism, they furnish the godchild's ceremonial clothing and defray the cost of the rite; in the case of a wedding, they contribute to the cost of the bridal outfit). As with the other features of Mexican-American culture shown above to be weakening, so, too, is compadrazgo. Grebler et al. (1970, p. 354) find "clear evidence that its function has diminished with urbanization," and that, although it is still viable, it "appears to be a minor feature of kinship and community social organization in the major urban centers" (p. 355). Peñalosa's (1970, p. 48) conclusions in this regard are identical: "In urban areas of southern California, at least, the traditional extended family group including siblings and their children is no longer found to any significant extent. The *compadrazgo* or ritual coparenthood relation no longer has any significance as a fictive kinship relation."

It must be concluded, then, that even the important aspects of Mexican-American culture are in variation, in accordance with the extent to which the site of the population is urban or not. Wherever the strength of these cultural features is seen to be weakening, social scientists account for the change with explanations of assimilation to the larger Anglo culture. To be discussed later is the question of what is happening to the traditional language of Mexican Americans.

THE USE OF LANGUAGE

The use of Spanish versus English is a subject that has not been ignored by those studying the speech of Mexican Americans (see for example, Barker 1975a, Grebler et al. 1970, Lance 1975a, Ornstein 1974, Peñalosa 1975a, Phillips 1972, Redlinger 1977, Saville-Troike 1976). As in the case of Spanish-English code-switching, to be discussed below, "there is a

73

complementary distribution of Spanish vs. English in the various do-
mains of living, with English generally reserved for the formal contexts
and Spanish the informal ones" (Ornstein 1974, p. 105). The mere pres-
ence of an Anglo can define the formality of the context, so that when an
Anglo leaves a conversational group, the percentage of Spanish used by
a bilingual Mexican American can as much as double (Lance 1972, p. 31).

By far the most in-depth analysis of Mexican-American language
usage is Barker (1975a), which discovers four linguistically identifiable
fields of interpersonal relations among Tucson Chicanos: intimate or
familial relations, informal relations, formal relations, and Anglo-
Mexican relations. Spanish dominates the first two fields (the second
field encompassing the domains of friendship, parish social life, and
community ceremonial relationships). In short, "The Southern Arizona
dialect thus comes to be identified with family background and minority
group membership" (p. 176). The use of English is reserved for formal
relations among bilinguals (including economic and some formal social
relationships) and in relations between Anglos and Mexican Americans.
The explanation for the use of English in place of formal Spanish is that
young children do not learn formal Spanish at home; the only formal
speech variety that they learn is English, through their school experi-
ence, and consequently they identify English with most formal relation-
ships (p. 177). As for Anglo-Mexican-American relations, Barker attrib-
utes the Chicano's insistence on speaking English, even when he knows
that the Anglo whom he is addressing knows Spanish, to the low status
of the Mexican-American minority in Tucson, and to the consequent low
status of Spanish in relation to English. Barker claims that, "some bi-
linguals who wish to improve their relations with Anglos will even deny
that they speak Spanish" (p. 177).

Barker further correlates (although not quantitatively) four pat-
terns of linguistic behavior with types of social experience in which
Mexican Americans in Tucson engage:

Bilinguals, type 1 (usually American-born) speak Southern Arizona dialect of
Spanish and substandard English; favor English and avoid Spanish in conversa-
tions with Anglos. Seek mobility through Anglo contacts.

Bilinguals, type 2 (including many immigrants) speak standard Mexican Spanish
and substandard English; favor Spanish in conversation with Anglos and tend
to be shy about their English. Seek mobility through Mexican community or are
apathetic.

Bilinguals, type 3 (mostly children of types 1 and 2) speak Southern Arizona
dialect of Spanish, Pachuco, and substandard English. Favor special language.
Reject both Mexican and Anglo groups and seek to form a society of their own.

Bilinguals, type 4 (including many "old families") speak standard Spanish,

74

Southern Arizona dialect, and standard English. Favor both standard English and standard Spanish. Marginal to both Mexican and Anglo groups. (p. 177)

Barker conceives the fields of interpersonal relations as a continuum, where intimate relations among Mexican Americans lie at one extreme and formal relations with Anglos lie at the other. Corresponding to this continuum is one of language usage, where Spanish falls on one end, English on the other, and in-between are the *pochismos*, the Pachuco dialect, and the various mixtures of Spanish and English. A further point made by Barker, one relevant to speech genre usage, is the fact that there is a lack of informal linguistic categories common to Anglos and Mexican Americans (because of their lack of interpersonal relations), so that, "Very few Mexicans can 'kid' and use small-talk entirely in English in a manner common among Anglos. Also, very few Anglos can speak the mixed Spanish-English common in informal usage among Tucson Mexicans" (p. 179).

Turning now to more quantitatively oriented studies that deal with Mexican-American language usage, we find the conclusions of Grebler et al. (1970, pp. 424–45) to the effect that "neighborhood and social-class factors as well as the individual's fluency in either language would have an independent effect on language use at home." Thus, Mexican-American children who live in predominantly Anglo areas (who therefore tend to have more Anglo associates) speak a great deal of English at home. And even poor parents who live in Anglo neighborhoods are forced into using English in the home, because of the English usage of their children.

As part of their effort to demonstrate the diversity within the Mexican-American minority in the Southwest, Grebler et al. (pp. 426–28), starting with Fishman's (1966) conceptualization of immigrant language shift, exemplify each of Fishman's stages of language acculturation using a particular Mexican-American community. Thus, the prototype of Fishman's first stage, where English is used in only a few domains (e.g., contacts with government or employer), would be the villages of northern New Mexico, which for many generations remained language islands. The Spanish-speaking population there, until as late as 1970, was characterized by relative isolation from the larger, English-speaking society,a situation that has promoted Spanish use and maintenance. The New Mexico state constitution further strengthens Spanish use by making it legitimate for various sorts of political participation: it prohibits discrimination on the basis of inability to speak, read, or write English, insofar as voting, holding office, or serving on juries is concerned. Typical of the second stage of linguistic acculturation, where immigrants

know more English and can use both mother tongue and English in several domains, are the *barrios* of San Antonio or El Paso, "where Mexican Americans must rub shoulders with the English-speaking community in a gesellschaft context. Such milieus are less totally isolated than those represented by the first stage, but lack of job opportunities in general makes it possible for many Mexican Americans to avoid contact with employers who demand fluent English. It is also in milieus such as this that the interference of the two languages results in the use of *pochismos*" (Grebler et al. 1970, p. 427).

The third stage, where the languages function independently of each other but both domains overlap and there is the highest number of bilinguals, is exemplified by low-income Mexican Americans who live in the predominantly ethnic sections of cities that have high job mobility opportunities (e.g., Los Angeles). In such a situation, there is a notable generational shift (Spanish is used by adults in domestic life, English by their children, in the same domain). Spanish takes on a symbolic use among friends who normally speak English to each other, and it takes on an increasing ideological significance in general (Grebler et al. 1970, p. 428). The prototype of the person who is in the fourth stage of linguistic acculturation (the monolingual English-speaker) is the *agringado*, who by definition is viewed negatively by the rest of the Mexican-American community, since he has rejected the group's language. He is the urban Mexican American whose parents already spoke primarily English: "Spanish has become as foreign to him as English is to the isolated pocket of Mexican Americans in the first stage" (Grebler et al. 1970, p. 420).

Redlinger (1977) reports on the use of Spanish and English among Mexican-American mothers when speaking to their children. Distinguishing language usage in five situational contexts—scolding, consoling, praising, labeling, and explaining—she discovers a tendency on the part of mothers to scold in Spanish, and the declining use of Spanish in consoling, praising, and labeling, the order of the latter three representing a descending scale of emotional involvement in the situation. Her explanation for the high incidence of the use of Spanish for the purpose of scolding is that "there appears to be a gut-level strength of Spanish expression on the deep emotional level that English is able to supercede only in cases of strong dominance" (p. 125). As for gender differences in the use of language, there is a somewhat greater use of Spanish on the part of fathers in all situations, especially in explaining.

76

LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

The subject of language maintenance encompasses both environmental factors (e.g., the role of the mass media) as well as attitudinal ones (e.g., attitude of the minority group toward its own language and culture, and toward the language of the majority; attitudes of the majority group toward the ethnic mother tongue). Before reviewing the literature that treats these subjects empirically, let us examine what scholars are saying in general about the maintenance of Spanish among Mexican Americans.

Christian and Christian (1966) provide an insightful historical perspective on the question of Mexican-American language maintenance. They explain that after the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848, whereby Mexico ceded to the United States most of what is now called the "Southwest" (Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and California), that area became flooded with English-speaking migrants. However, there was insufficient contact between Anglos and Mexicans for the language and culture of the former to be transmitted to the latter, and despite the fact that Anglos made no effort to force Mexicans to give up their traditional ways,

. . . Spanish became the language of the conquered, of second-class citizens. Although it was retained as an important tongue in the Southwest, spoken by millions of people, it persisted more through lack of overpowering interference than through active efforts to maintain its vigor. The strong persistence of the language in this country is also due in part to the proximity of Mexico and to the immigration of millions of people from that country, most of them coming for short periods and usually without the skills or motivation necessary to acquire a new language and culture. Furthermore, cross-cultural contacts have been discouraged—often by both groups—and this lack of mutual acceptance or understanding between the Hispanos and the dominant English-speaking "Anglos" has also served to inhibit acquisition of English among the former. (P. 281).

Currently, several forces are at work that together serve to undermine Spanish maintenance in the Southwest. One of them is that Anglos who work in an official capacity (e.g., law, politics, justice) with Spanish-speaking people have typically not been required to speak Spanish, and very few have ever attained a sufficient proficiency in the language to be able to communicate with their Mexican-American clients.

A second force working against Spanish maintenance, namely, Mexican-American organizations themselves, seems to be one that has changed its past orientation. Up until the mid-sixties, according to Christian and Christian (p. 293), the most influential leaders of Mexican-American organizations (e.g., LULAC) tended to be the most Anglified

and completely oriented toward persuading their members to assimilate Anglo ways, including effective fluency in English. However, this cannot be said to be the case today, for the current Chicano movement is dedicated to the preservation of Mexican-American ethnic identity, a large part of which rests on the maintenance of Spanish.

A third element singled out by these authors (pp. 294–95) as impeding the maintenance of Spanish among Mexican Americans is the Catholic Church. They offer two explanations for the Church's attempts at Anglifying Chicanos. One is its reaction to the strongly anticlerical feelings of Mexican Americans (despite a concomitant deep religiosity). The other is the wide variation in national background among Catholic priests in the Southwest, which has impeded the development of a unified Church policy toward Spanish language use. Fishman (1966), commenting on the role of the Catholic Church in the maintenance of non-English mother tongues in general, calls it a force second only to the American school system in wiping out ethnic languages.

Empirical studies of Spanish maintenance in the Southwest are equivocal concerning the long-term trends. Based on interviews at 544 households in two counties of South Texas, Skrabanek (1970) concludes that, "the Mexican American has been highly successful in retaining the Spanish language for well over a century in the midst of a dominant American culture," as evidenced by the finding that, "Not one person living in a Mexican-American home and old enough to talk was found who did not speak Spanish fluently, and an overwhelming majority speak Spanish more fluently than English" (p. 275). This is apparently the result of patterns of language usage whereby household heads use Spanish with greater frequency (in both the urban and rural areas sampled), whether it be with other adults in the home, with children in the home, or in visits to friends' homes. Even at work, more than half the respondents were found to use Spanish as the dominant language. As for Spanish maintenance among the younger population, it was found (p. 276) that, "Although the younger children in the study households tend to use Spanish less than their older brothers and sisters and the older children, in turn, less than the parents, the Spanish language is nevertheless being retained to a relatively high degree among the younger Mexican Americans" (when talking with adults or other children in their homes or when playing or visiting with friends, more than half of both the younger and older children sampled were found to use mostly Spanish; only in school do a high proportion of them use mainly English, and this only because the school requires it).

Skrabanek identifies a number of factors that he believes are responsible for Spanish maintenance among Mexican Americans. They

78

include the fact that Mexican Americans who are primarily English speaking, and who generally attain the highest levels of education, are those who earn the highest incomes and hold the highest status occupations. It is they who tend to move out of Mexican-American neighborhoods, leaving behind the primarily Spanish-speaking community which, consequently, remains lacking in visible evidence of the association between speaking English and deriving socioeconomic advantages from the larger society. The other factors are labelled by Skrabanek as ethnic ones: the Spanish language is the primary symbol of the cultural dichotomy between Anglos and Mexican Americans, and thus serves to maintain the solidarity and cohesiveness of the latter as a group; there are sharply contrasting differences in value orientations between Mexican-American and Anglo culture; the close proximity to Mexico and the fact that Mexican Americans tend to remain within the same geographical area contribute to the maintenance of the subculture and the Spanish language; Mexican Americans are spatially isolated from Anglos; there is a sense of social solidarity among group members, causing them to speak Spanish with one another, even when all the parties to a conversation are fluent in English, this sense of solidarity being epitomized in the concept of *La Raza*.[5] On the whole, Skrabanek's prediction is that the Spanish language will continue to be maintained in the Southwest far into the future.

Another study on Mexican-American mother-tongue maintenance comes to the opposite conclusion. Thompson (1974) questions the reliability of the 1970 census data on Mexican-American language loyalty, and carries out his own study among 136 Chicanos living in an Austin, Texas barrio. According to Thompson, the Texas census data confirm Fishman's (1966) assessment that Spanish, in contrast to other ethnic group languages, which, by the third generation of immigrants are totally replaced by English, has reached a state of stable bilingualism. This is to say that Spanish is transferring to the third generation.[6] Thompson questions the validity of the census data on the grounds that the nature of the census questions itself constitutes a source of distortion. Specifically, if a respondent replied "yes" to the question of whether a language other than English was spoken in the home when he was a child, that language was considered by the census not only as the respondent's mother tongue, but that of his children as well. In effect, "A non-English language was considered a person's mother tongue if anyone in the household spoke it when the respondent was a child" (p. 9). Furthermore, all other persons living in such a family, where the head or wife reported Spanish as his or her mother tongue, were also classified as Spanish language. Thus, because frequency of language usage and

79

language acquisition are not taken into account, if one generation ever spoke Spanish in the home the census considered it to be the mother tongue of the next generation, whether the latter knew it or not.

Analyzing the findings based on his own study, Thompson discovers that when generation and age are the primary variables under consideration, the Texas census data are confirmed: stable bilingualism does exist (the third generation household is still predominantly Spanish speaking). However, when he adds the variable of childhood residence, a language shift is revealed to be in progress. Thus, "At what age a person moved to the city is more important than how long he has lived there" (p. 13), and what childhood residence really is reflective of is an urban/rural dichotomy. Thompson concludes, therefore, that the language shift he finds among Austin Mexican Americans follows the pattern of other immigrant languages as described by Fishman (1966), namely, the first generation prefers to use only Spanish in the home, whereas the second generation is bilingual.

The Mass Media

The use of the ethnic mother tongue by the mass media is considered to be one powerful force in the maintenance of that tongue (Fishman 1966). It would, therefore, be important to review the role that the media have been playing in the maintenance of Spanish among Mexican Americans. Christian and Christian (1966, p. 296), writing in the mid-sixties, found, with regard to the press, a sharply decreasing market for exclusively Spanish newspapers. Radio, on the other hand, was found to be the one and only force promoting Spanish (at the time, among the more than three hundred radio stations in the U.S. that were broadcasting in Spanish, about two-thirds were in the Southwest). In fact, Spanish radio program managers have been singled out as, *"the largest single group of leaders of the Spanish speaking who are directly interested in the language and the culture, on the one hand, and in close touch with the Anglo world on the other"* (p. 297).

Coltharp (1965, p. 12), points to the influential role of the mass media in Spanish maintenance among the Pachuco-speaking community of El Paso. Commenting on the presence of the El Paso radio stations, which broadcast in English, and the close and powerful Juárez stations, which use only Spanish, Coltharp observes that she had not heard any radio in South El Paso tuned to an El Paso station. In contrast, Spanish-speaking residents of the areas tune in to the El Paso television stations, which broadcast in English, rather than to the one in Juárez. As for the cinema, it, too, plays a maintaining role: the one movie theatre in

80

the area shows Spanish-language films or *American films with Spanish dubbed in*. Grebler et al. (1970, p. 429) also see in the media a powerful influence on Spanish maintenance and, as do the authors mentioned above, they cite the impact of Spanish-language radio as the most far-reaching of the media, although Spanish-language television is seen to be growing in large cities.[7] Despite the fact that many of these stations are VHF, which means that often converters must be bought to receive the broadcasts, they have wide appeal.

Only one empirical piece of research has been found that is devoted to Spanish language media usage, and that is Lopez and Enos' (1973) study of Spanish-language-only television (SLO-TV) in Los Angeles County. Reporting on their analysis of media utilization, attitudes, and significant demographic characteristics of those who watch SLO-TV in Southern California, and basing their conclusions on 750 in-home interviews with Spanish-speaking adults (whether they were of Mexican-American background or not), Lopez and Enos discover that Spanish language television is primarily a class phenomenon that has its ethnic aspects (p. 309). In general, those who watch the station are typically foreign-born, have a low income ($10,000/year or less), a low level of schooling (high school education or less), and are thirty years old or over (young people are apparently not interested in viewing Spanish-language television).

Language Attitudes

An important variable that enters into the equation of language maintenance is language attitudes: attitudes on the part of the ethnic group toward its own language and toward that of the dominant culture, and attitudes of the majority toward the language of the ethnic group. The interplay of both is significant in determining the fate of the ethnic mother tongue. Unquestionably, up until the advent of the Chicano movement, the attitude of Mexican Americans toward their own varieties of Spanish has been a negative one. We have already seen a hint of that attitude in Barker's (1975a) observation regarding the unwillingness of Mexican Americans to speak Spanish in front of Anglos, and their denial of even a knowledge of Spanish; and it can be seen in Sawyer's (1975) finding that San Antonio Mexican Americans reject the use of Spanish loans borrowed by English. Poulter (1970), in a study of the voiceless stops of bilingual Mexican Americans living in the Fort Worth-Dallas area, sees the attitude of the bilinguals toward their variety of Spanish as an inferior one. They regard the Spanish of their Mexican relatives as "good" Spanish, and consider their own language to be not

even a dialect, but "the bastard result of the improper mixing of two languages" (p. 43). They consider Spanish to be their second language and feel incompetent to use it with Latin American Spanish speakers. Mexican-American college students want to know in what ways their Spanish is deficient in comparison with Latin American standard varieties. Code-switching, too, is looked down upon by Chicanos themselves. One Mexican-American sociolinguistic investigator himself attributes a negative quality to the phenomenon when he asks (Ortego 1974, pp. 74–75), "how is he [the Chicano] further disadvantaged, and how is he further debilitated because he happens to speak that way."

There are indications, however, that the attitude of Chicanos toward their ways of speaking Spanish is undergoing a major change as a direct consequence of the Chicano movement's efforts to instill pride in Mexican-American language and culture. Ornstein (1974, p. 107), for instance, notes the changing sociolinguistic atmosphere in the Southwest as younger Chicanos are becoming politicized and as Mexican-American attitudes "toward Southwest Spanish as a low-prestige dialect, often disdainfully treated as 'Tex-Mex' and 'Border Lingo' by Anglos and Mexican Americans alike, are slowly changing, particularly in the schools." He cites the introduction of a new course at California State College called, "Bilingual Communication Skills for Mexican Americans: Pocho Spanish to Standard Spanish," as evidence of this changing attitude.

Tovar (1974) echoes Ornstein when she observes the changing attitudes of Chicanos toward their Spanish. Describing the attitudes prevalent up through the mid-sixties, she comments:

Achievement-conscious Mexican Americans concentrated their efforts towards erasing all traces of Spanish from their speech. In fact, the ability to speak Spanish became for many a cause for embarrassment. Those Mexican Americans who used a mingling of Spanish and English words were classified by societal and educational standards as "disadvantaged" and "culturally deprived," and their language was considered substandard. Undoubtedly the majority of Mexican Americans accepted this judgment for years. . . . (P. 64).

Tovar admits that such attitudes are still in existence among Mexican Americans who have assimilatory goals, but that the Chicano movement is gaining in influence, to the point where Chicano literature (essays, poetry, drama, fiction) is being created, written "in Spanish, in English, in combinations of Spanish-English, in Pachucano, and in combinations of Pachucano-Spanish-English" (p. 70). Although the Chicano movement may be making headway in the area of changing language attitudes, some areas remain untouched: "Chicano announcers are now found on television as long as they have no telltale accent" (Peñalosa

82

1975b, p. 8); moreover, the majority of Spanish-language radio announcers have typically been imported from Mexico itself, and the practice is not yet dead.

The negative attitude traditionally characteristic of Mexican Americans toward their own language has much of its basis in Anglo attitudes toward them, their culture, and their language. Probably most blameworthy in inculcating in the wider Anglo population a scorn for Chicano speech varieties are Anglo schoolteachers. Paralleling the former attitudes of white schoolteachers toward black English dialects, "Educators generally consider Chicano language 'Pocho Spanish,' so substandard that they sometimes refer to the children who speak it as alingual" (Garcia 1975).

A highly revealing early article (Fitz-Gerald 1921) that dealt with Anglo attitudes toward Mexican-American language maintenance brought up the issue of language loyalty (and ethnic group loyalty) and its association with nation-state disloyalty. The fear on the part of Anglos was that immigrant groups who clung tenaciously to their foreign ways would, in times of war, aid the enemy if the ethnic group was allied with that enemy. Given the time at which the article was written (shortly after the end of World War I), the sentiments are understandable, yet bias and bigotry are rampant throughout the article. The writer addresses himself to the debate that had been going on at the time in New Mexico, over the issue of whether elementary schools would adopt a bilingual policy (teaching literacy in Spanish, in the first three grades, and only oral English during that period, with written matter in English to be introduced in the last three years), or an all-English policy, but using bilingual teachers who could resort to the use of Spanish for the purpose of explaining things (the latter proposal was adopted by the New Mexico state legislature in 1919).

One aspect of Anglo attitudes toward Chicano speech involves reactions to accented English; this area of investigation grows out of the pioneering research of Lambert and his associates (Lambert 1967, Lambert et al. 1965, Lambert et al. 1966). In a review of research on the subject, Ryan and Carranza (1976), referring to past research of their own, explain that student raters of accented speech take into account the appropriateness of the speech style for the situation in their evaluations of speakers from different ethnic groups. Thus, sixty-three Mexican-American, black, and Anglo female high school students in Chicago were asked to rate the personalities of male speakers of standard English and Mexican-American accented English in two contexts, home and school, with two sets of rating scales, status-stressing and solidarity-stressing. In every case, the standard English speakers were rated more

positively, but there were significantly greater differences in the school context than in the home context, and similarly, on the status-stressing scales than on the solidarity-stressing scales. Furthermore, Anglo evaluators rated accented speakers significantly lower in status than did black and Mexican-American students.

In a summary of the findings of the dissertation of one of the authors (Carranza 1976), Ryan and Carranza (1976, pp. 30–31) report that language preferences (Spanish vs. English) and attitudes towards accentedness on the part of three subgroups of Mexican-American parents (native-born, foreign-born with more than fifteen years U.S. residence, and more recently arrived foreign-born persons) were such that foreign-born persons showed a strong communicative preference for Spanish while native-born persons were more neutral. Second, despite their communicative preference for Spanish, the foreign-born, long-term U.S. residents saw almost no instrumental value for Spanish, whereas recently arrived persons strongly preferred English for instrumental reasons. Perhaps the most significant overall finding of this study is the lack of coincidence between language preference and accentedness. This leads the author to believe that the two may be distinct aspects of the language attitude framework, for language preference represents a choice *between* languages, while attitude toward accentedness represents a choice of varieties *within* a language (standard English vs. Mexican-American accented English).

One last study on language attitudes to be reported on here, one which weakens the generally presumed relationship between accented speech and negative evaluation on the part of standard language speakers, is that of Hendrickson (1973). Anglo middle-class evaluators (urban, "liberal" business and professional people), were asked to judge the amount of "accent" in the television tape recordings of Chicano students. Surprisingly,

Their impressionistic judgments of the students' overall effectiveness in verbal communication were apparently influenced predominantly not by "correctness" or conformity with middle-class patterns of pronunciation and usage but rather by what may be loosely called fluency. In fact, even their awareness of non-standard features in the students' speech seemed to depend much more on fluency than on the actual presence or absence of such features. For instance students who conversed freely and easily with an Anglo middle-class adult interviewer were perceived as having little or no "accent," even when Spanish influence on their pronunciation of English was strongly evident. (Hendrickson 1973, p. 1 in Metcalf 1974, p. 54)

Just as Mexican-American culture and society must be viewed as essentially heterogeneous in nature, so, too, must Mexican-American Spanish. Ornstein (1972), as we have seen earlier, has managed to classify the different varieties of Spanish within the framework of the overall language situation in the Southwest. Elsewhere (1970) he states quite plainly that, "It cannot be over-emphasized that the appellation 'Southwest Spanish' itself must be used with caution, since it is nothing more or less than a useful portmanteau term covering a considerable number of language varieties" (p. 165). Christian and Christian (1966, pp. 290–91) also point out the regional and class differences in the Spanish of the Southwest. They find that the upper Rio Grande and southern Colorado are characterized by an archaic Spanish, while in the slums of cities such as El Paso, Albuquerque, Los Angeles, Phoenix, and San Jose, there is an argot or *caló* comprehensible only to members of Mexican-American teenage gangs, called "Pachucos." In addition, among Mexican peasants who are newly arrived to the Southwest, simple, rural Mexican Spanish is found, particularly in the lower Rio Grande valley. Troike (1968, p. 178) concurs regarding the diversity within Mexican-American Spanish. Out of a desire to disparage the "dangerous myth" that there exists in Texas a supposedly corrupt form of Spanish known as "Tex-Mex," he brings to light the fact that there are several native dialects of Spanish spoken in Texas alone, and that even in a single city (e.g., San Antonio or El Paso), several dialects coexist (Troike classifies these as local varieties of North Mexican Spanish). Similarly, Barker (1975b, p. 183) identifies, for Tucson alone, four varieties of Spanish: the southern Arizona dialect of Spanish, standard Mexican Spanish, the Yaqui dialect of Spanish, and Pachuco. Cárdenas (1975) divides the Spanish Southwest into four zones: Texas, New Mexico-S. Colorado, Arizona, and California.

Despite the fact that several geographic dialects of Spanish exist in the wide area that is populated by Mexican Americans, it is nevertheless important to analyze some of them from a purely linguistic point of view, especially when we intersect linguistic code with society (i.e., when we touch on the subjects of language use, language loyalty and maintenance, and code-switching).

Spanish Dialectical Features

The most frequently made point regarding the dialectal features (particularly the phonological ones) of Southwest Spanish is that they are not unique to the U.S. Southwest: many of them have their origin in the

85

Spanish that the early settlers brought with them from Spain, and are attested in the lower-class (particularly peasant) speech of Latin America; many forms are merely archaic; and others were nonstandard even for the Spanish of sixteenth-century Spain. In any case, as most writers take pains to point out, they should not be viewed as signs of "corruption" or "degeneracy."

Phonology / Post (1933) enumerates a wide range of features peculiar to Arizona Spanish: the accent is shifted to the more open of two contiguous vowels (*cáir, léido, incréible, máis, periódo, ociáno*); the accent is shifted to the first syllable in the present subjunctive, first person plural, of all verbs of more than two syllables (*váyamos, véngamos, siéntamos*); diphthongization (*almuada, lión, pueta, golpiar*); vowel changes generally do not involve accented vowels: what does change quite often is the vowel of infinitival endings, so that new infinitives are usually formed in -*iar*, some in -*ear* and -*ar* (*galopiar, trotiar*); vocalic groups simplify, that is to say, clusters of two vowels are reduced to one, generally the first one being lost (*orrar, orcar, ogarse, p'onde*); the bilabial fricative sound [b̶], which in orthography appears as 'b' or 'v', is pronounced as a labiodental sound (i.e., [v]), when it occurs between vowels (*uva*, the fruit; *kuv̶a*, the country); orthographic *bue-* and *vue-*, when they occur at the beginning of a word are sometimes pronounced [gwe-], but generally [we-] (*weno, welta*); the velar voiceless fricative sound [x] is often substituted for [f] (*xwego, xwe, xwerte, dixunto*); all *d*s that occur at the end of a word are lost (*verdá, mercé*); the sound represented orthographically as either *c* or *x* (the latter being phonetically ([ks]), is dropped in consonant clusters (*letor, perfeto, sesto, estranjero*); the sound that occurs in orthography as *ll* is generally pronounced [y] (*cabayo, siya*).

    Bowen (1972, p. 159) mentions some of the phonological features pointed out by Post, finding them to exist in New Mexican Spanish, adding to them metathesis (*pader* for *pared*); the softening of *y* to the point where it is dropped between a higher and lower front or mid vowel—specifically between *i* and *e, a, o*, and between *e* and *a, o* (thus *mia* and *milla* are not distinguished, and the pronunciations of *ella, ladrillo*, and *cabello*, respectively, are *ea, ladrio*, and *cabeo*); since a sequence of two front vowels (except *ie*) is not tolerated in succession in the same word, *y* is epenthetically introduced (*creyer, leyer, reyir*).

    Lance (1975a), in his analysis of dialectal forms in Texas Spanish, pinpoints several features that he attributes to general diachronic phonological developments common in both New World and Andalusian Spanish. The most widespread is that of /s/ becoming somewhat like English /h/. Contrary to the more widely held view, Lance stresses that

86

this phenomenon did not descend from the precolonial dialects of southern Spain, but rather, represents a parallel diachronic development. His interpretation, however, does not leave one convinced. Words reflecting this phenomenon in Texas Spanish would be *misma, tres, español, nosotros*. The only phonological forms Lance mentions that are overlooked by Post and Bowen are archaisms, such as *semos* for *somos*, *salemos* for *salimos*, *haiga* for *haga*.

In her study of language and education among Mexican-American schoolchildren in Los Angeles, Lastra de Suárez (1975) mentions two phonological characteristics of their Spanish that are not attributable to the influence of English, and that the writers mentioned above have not found in their investigations, namely, [č] → [š] (*éše, šikíto, mušášo*), and [f] → [ɸ] (*aɸuera*). Surprisingly, Lastra de Suárez considers the use of [v] in place of [b] (e.g., *palavras, ves, cavalo*) not to be related to English influence, for it would seem that it is indeed. One also wonders at the validity of the sampling procedure used in the study. The children interviewed (sixty-five school children in total, forty-two of whom came from the same school) all were of working-class background. Thus, the title of her article is misleading, since it refers to "los niños de orígen mexicano en Los Angeles," but in actuality restricts itself to one social class of Chicanos, ignoring the other social strata. Furthermore, the sample is unbalanced: the Spanish of the sixty-five school children is compared with that of only nine adults, whereas only six children were interviewed for the analysis of their English. In addition, two preschoolers were included in the Spanish analysis, thereby introducing the variable of language development and acquisition. In short, the study suffers from methodological shortcomings.

Grammar / Grammatical characteristics of Southwest Spanish have been examined by a number of scholars (Garcia 1975, Bowen 1972, Ornstein 1975, Sanchez 1972), but perhaps the most comprehensive treatment is Hensey (1973). Drawing his conditions from a cross-section of grammatical deviations occurring in a corpus of 365 essays written by young people at the University of Texas at El Paso, and comparing the deviations with Standard Mexican Spanish, Hensey creates an elaborate breakdown of three major categories of deviations: noun phrases, verb phrases, and transformations. Most of the noun phrase deviations deal with determiners, for example, their addition (**quisiera ser una profesora*), or deletion (**se va a clase*). (Note that words or sentences preceded by an asterisk are thereby represented as being grammatically deviant.) The verb phrase deviations are all morphophonemic in nature,[8] such as stem class (**concedar, *debatar*), metaphony[9] and stem change (**podimos, *vení*),

participles (**gente bien prepara*), replacement of first person singular (**yo será*, **yo tuvo*), movement of stress in the first person plural (**sépamos*, **dígamos*), and *ver* for *haber* (**nunca me viera cansado*). The deviations involving transformations are the most numerous, and so examples of all of them cannot be given here. The major categories of transformational deviations include, for instance, concord (both gender and number, **un persona bondadosa*, **todos los chicano*), sentence embedding (in particular, the use of the gerund, **leyendo historias me da tiempo*, **soy una estudiante queriendo*), mode selection (either subjunctive replaced by indicative, **prefieren a los que no son chicanos*, or indicative replaced by subjunctive, **El Paso, aunque sea ciudad pequeña*), and reflexivization and pseudo-reflexivization (**se hace mucho calor*, **quiero que todo aregla ya*).

Hensey's analysis, although commendable for its thoroughness, is questionable at some points. For instance, some speakers of standard Spanish might find "se va a clase" a good sentence; furthermore, "prefieren a los que no son chicanos" and "El Paso, aunque sea ciudad pequēna" are also standard sentences. In the case of the latter, one would have to know the mental intention of the speaker to ascertain whether his/her use of *aunque* is concessive or not. The same is true of indicative/subjunctive pairs such as "algo que promete/prometa seguridad," and "cuando podré/pueda ir." Perhaps the context surrounding such sentences would reveal to the investigator the mental intention of the writer/speaker, and in that case Hensey may be correct in judging as nonstandard those examples which he has. That information, of course, is not available to the reader of his article. However, one would definitely have to disagree with him in his starring "soy un estudiante de comercios" for being equally as nonstandard as ***"quiero ser una profesora."

One of the most exhaustive recent compilations of nonstandard phenomena in Chicano Spanish, in the realms of phonology, grammar, lexicon, and code-switching, is the work of Rosaura Sanchez (1972). Sanchez' grammatical analysis is both thorough and insightful, covering phenomena related to verb tense and mood, verb morphology, pronouns, nouns, adjectives and adverbs. Based on an analysis of the written compositions (sample N = 30) and speech (both tape recorded and spontaneously observed, N = 17) of Mexican-American students at the University of Texas at Austin, Sanchez' findings confirm those of Hensey regarding the low use of the subjunctive in expressions of doubt or negation. However, she notices a tendency to retain the subjunctive in expressions of hope (*Ojalá que téngamos tiempo*) and in some indirect commands (*A nosotros los católicos nos dice que estéyamos preparados*). Particularly interesting, within the realm of syntax, is her systematic analysis of subjunctive/indicative usage in contrary-to-fact statements. She

88

finds that the mood of the verbs in such sentences can be uniformly sub-junctive (*Si viera tenido un auto, yo te viera visitado*), uniformly indicative (*Te decía si sabía*), or subjunctive/indicative (*Si no fuera por la idea, ahorita no tuvíamos Chicano Studies*) and vice-versa (*Te dijiera si sabía*).

One grammatical variable of which Hensey makes no mention, but which is often noted (Lance 1975a, Garcia 1975, Ornstein 1975, Sanchez 1972) is the *-ates* ending (instead of *-aste*) for the second person singular preterite. Garcia (1975) comments on the "logicalness" of this particular regularization, as well as on the "utility" and "efficiency" of other modifications, such as the generalization of the present/past contrast in the first person plural forms of *-er* and *ir* verbs in the preterite (comemos: comimos = vivemos: vivimos). The regularization of certain radical changing verbs (*pedir, seguir, decir*), although only briefly exemplified in Hensey, is fully demonstrated in Bowen (1972). Thus, the present conjugation of *pedir* is *pido, pides, pide, pidemos, piden*; the imperfect is *pidía*, and the preterite *pidí, pidites, pidió, pidimos, pidieron*.

Lexicon / What is distinctive about the Southwest Spanish lexicon (excluding, for the moment, consideration of English influence) is, first, the presence of a large number of archaic vocabulary items (Espinosa, Jr. 1975, Ornstein 1975, Rael 1975), particularly in New Mexico, where there are sixteenth-century archaisms such as *ansi, añidir, dende, de contino, endenantes, escurana, mesmo,* and *ivierno*; and second, the processes of blending (creation of a new word from the fusion of two words that are similar in form, e.g., *plázamo,* "congratulations," from *pláceme* and *pésamo*), and analogy (a word already in existence changes under the influence of a morphological pattern already in existence, e.g., *impedimiento < impedimento*).

The Influence of English

Although the influence of English is most striking and widespread in the area of lexicon, phonology and grammar have been affected as well, and should therefore be treated here. Nowhere is the sociolinguistic phenomenon of languages in contact so important to the main subject of this review as it is in the impact of English on the Spanish of Mexican Americans.

Looking first at phonological influences, Tsuzaki (1970) finds new phonemes (in initial position, /j-/ and /š-/; in final position, /-p/, /-t/, /-k/, /-b/, and /-č/); new clusters (in initial position, /st-/ and /sk-/; in final position, /-ts/, /-ks/, /-gs/, /-nk/, and /-nč/); and new combinations (/-tb-/, /-td-/, and /-nw-/). Lastra de Suárez (1975, p. 63) finds in the speech of

Los Angeles bilingual schoolchildren a retroflex *r* (in environments as varied as those found in *carne, enfermo, ropa,* and *pero*); trilled *r* replaced by the flapped *r* (*arriba*); trilled *r* in place of the flapped *r*, as a hyper-correction (*pero*); s → z (*José, sumo*); x → h (*México*); juncture[10] between two consecutive vowels ([mi + ermano]); and glottal stop between two consecutive vowels and in initial position preceding a vowel ([mi ? er-mano], [?ermano]); es0 → s0, that is to say, the loss of initial /e/ before a cluster of /s/ plus an occlusive (/spañol/, /stá/); [g] → [g] (*pega, amiga*). Phillips (1972, 1975) finds the influence of English [v] on what would be normally the complementary distribution of [b] and [ƀ] in Spanish.[11] He finds that intervocalically, [b] is rare, while [ƀ] is more commonly used than [v]; following a nasal, if the nasal is word-interior, [b] always fol-lows; in the environment following a non-nasal consonant, there is al-most no use of the stop; whereas preceding a consonant, [ƀ] is by far the most generally used variant. In his empirical study of Los Angeles Span-ish phonology, Phillips (1975) also came across the occasional use of English vowels (/æ and /a/) and English consonants (/θ/, /z/, and /š/) in what are otherwise Spanish words, pronounced with Spanish phono-logical segments. Unfortunately, the findings of Lastra de Suárez and Phillips must be viewed with caution, since their studies suffer from methodological deficiencies. In particular, both have relatively small samples, but break the speakers down into groups according to several characteristics (e.g., age, language dominance, social rank). Conclu-sions based on the comparison of such small subgroupings cannot yield statistically meaningful results.

   Insofar as the influence of English on the grammar of Spanish is concerned, there is ample evidence of the existence of transfer. Brisk (1974) analyzes the syntax of five-year-old children of New Mexico. Classifying the range of phenomena as interference involving the use of an English structure, she discovers the adjective-noun word order of English noun phrases (*Mira un chiquito monkey*), Spanish usually placing the adjective after the noun; the use of *ser* and *estar* instead of *tener* (*Yo está cinco*); the use of *como asina* in the way that English uses "like this" (*se va como asina*); and the deletion of the article in certain nominalized clauses, parallel to the English construction "Look what" (*Mira que yo tengo.*)

   Solé (1975, p. 177), analyzing the Spanish used by the mass me-dia, finds the integration of English rules into Texas Spanish to be so widespread that, "The Mexican-American Spanish code should, con-sequently, be viewed not so much as a substandard code of Spanish, but as a system fused with English features." She enumerates a wide variety of phenomena reflective of the integration of English rules, among them

(1) the usage of disjunctive pronouns for conjunctive forms (*Es muy difícil para nosotros actuar*), (2) the nondeletion of subject forms (*Yo dije que yo no se*), (3) the usage of progressive aspect of explicit duration (*Estamos teniendo cielos nublados*), and (4) misapplication of a number of prepositions (*por* and *para, con* for *de, sobre* for *en, enfrente* for *frente*) and phenomena related to sentence embedding (*El mapa nos enseña nubes cubriendo*) and word order (*Lluvias se esperan*).

Solé also presents a number of phenomena that she does not consider to be attributable to transfer from English. Instead, she classifies them as internal developments caused by insufficient learning on the part of speakers. However, one would have to disagree with her placement of certain variables into this non-English transfer category: adjectival derivations (*financial; preversible*), choice of pronominal forms (*qué* for *cuál, qué* for *cuántos*), and adjective placement of restrictive and nonrestrictive adjectives (*La más grande casa que se ha hecho*) all seem to bear the imprint of English rules. On the whole, however, Solé's article makes a significant contribution to theories regarding the nature of Southwest Spanish. Her thesis that deviations in Southwest Spanish are to be considered as evidence of either borrowing from English or of insufficient learning of any standard Spanish variety is well explained:

The great majority of Mexican-American bilinguals lack the opportunity to acquire the linguistic competence commensurate with the topics, styles and domains in question, but do have the opportunity to develop it in English. Their limited role repertoire in Spanish must result in a limited verbal repertoire. Consequently, whenever the occasion calls for contextual variants to which the speakers have not been exposed in Spanish, their only recourse is borrowing from English. For these reasons it is more justifiable and consistent with the facts to look at the data in terms of the underlying rules of English and Spanish, than to do so in terms of standard Spanish exclusively. Likewise, most of the grammatical variables encountered can also be accounted for by dual linguistic sources, instead of merely being described as deviations from Spanish. (P. 172)

By far the strongest impact that English has had on the Spanish of Mexican Americans is in the realm of vocabulary (Beltramo and Porcel 1975; Bowen 1954, 1972, 1975; Brisk 1974; Espinosa 1975; Ortiz 1949; Sawyer 1975; Trager and Valdez 1937; Tsuzaki 1970). The lists of loans abound. Apparently, so overwhelmingly great was the spread of English lexical items to Southwest Spanish speakers, that it caused language purists such as Malló (1954) to vent an all-out attack on the supposedly "corrupting" influence of English on the Spanish language. The extent to which anglicisms invaded Spanish reached epidemic proportions, wrote Malló in 1954, and he proposed that the process be firmly halted. Bowen (1954) replied to Malló with vehemence, enlightening him with some fundamental linguistic notions, such as the fact of linguistic change

over time. In rebuttal to one of Malló's many emotional points, Bowen made the following statement, one which predates by two decades the present general feeling toward this hybridized Spanish of Mexican Americans:

If someone took more than a curio interest in the Hispanic culture of this country, perhaps the native speakers would be more reluctant to see this culture die out, just as surely as the criticism leveled at "regionalisms" through the classroom is encouraging and willingness to transfer culturally and completely to English, leaving the Spanish language and culture to certain extinction. Mr. Malló suggests . . . that we should preserve the language of Cervantes. I fully agree, but I think we should do so in a graduate course on the history of the Spanish language, not in a Spanish course for beginning students. (P. 331)

The numerous words from English adopted by Southwest Spanish can be categorized into several groups. Trager and Valdez (1937), for example, group the lexical items into direct loan words ("coat," "sweater," "radio," "sink," "bumper," etc., the words coming primarily from the domains of clothing, household furnishings and equipment, food, automobiles, school, business, and money); loan shifts, i.e., words similar in English and Spanish, but that have different meanings, and that have acquired the English meaning (*librería*, "library," Span. "biblioteca"; *colegio*, "college," Span. "universidad"); regular members of the Spanish lexicon whose phonological shape has been slightly changed on account of confusion with the corresponding word (*acento*, "accent," [aksento]; *aritmética*, "arithmetic," [ariθmétika]); and loan translations (*escuela alta*, "high school"; *hombre de negocios*, "businessman"). Tsuzaki (1970, p. 64) and Cornejo (1973, pp. 83–84) isolate loan blends, as well, these being forms that combine a borrowed element with a native element (*suimear*, "to swim"; *cachar*, "to catch"; *mapeador*, "to mop").

Special Speech Varieties: Argots, Calos

One special speech variety that is properly the domain of Spanish-speaking teenage male gang members in the Southwest has been given considerable attention by observers of the Southwest sociolinguistic scene. Generally called Pachuco (after the designation of the gang members, who themselves are called Pachucos), although in South El Paso in-group members prefer the term *tirilí* and accordingly call themselves Tirilones, this speech variety has been called, alternatively, a slang, a jargon, a caló, and an argot. Most writers agree that it incorporates aspects of these speech genres, although argot and caló seem to win out over the rest (an argot being a special vocabulary and idiom used by a

92

particular underworld group, especially as a means of private com- munication, or else used by a particular social group or class; caló being a language spoken by Spanish gypsies and widely influencing the argots of the Spanish-speaking underworld and bullfighting). Actually, two labels are appropriate for this speech variety: when it is used as the predominant way of talking by adolescent male gang members, it is best considered an argot; when it is used sporadically by members of the larger Chicano society it should be thought of as a slang. Ultimately, the basis for its classification must rest on such factors as extent of use and purpose for use, as the discussion below will demonstrate. As a speech variety it is particularly important sociolinguistically because linguisti- cally naive observers, as Ornstein (1972, p. 75) points out, including Mexican Americans, confuse it with general Southwest Spanish, calling it such pejorative terms as "Tex-Mex," "pocho," and "border lingo."

Although the precise history of Pachuco is not known, it is be- lieved (Braddy 1956, p. 99) to have originated in about 1931, when Pachuco gangs first won notoriety for their narcotics smuggling activi- ties in the El Paso-Juárez area. During World War II, El Paso Pachucos, characteristically dressed in zoot suits, migrated to Los Angeles, and left the mark of their argot in the major Spanish-speaking cities in between, including Tucson. Supposedly, it was a skirmish between a Los Angeles Pachuco gang and some Anglo sailors on leave at one point in the War that brought this Mexican-American subgroup and its argot to national attention, for in the fight, some of the sailors were killed, and the result- ing trial of the Pachucos received nationwide publicity, causing an Anglo backlash against not merely such adolescent gangs, but against Mexican Americans in general.

As a Spanish speech variety, Pachuco borrows heavily not only from Mexican but also from American slang which makes the argot so difficult for Mexican Americans to understand. The other characteristics that distinguish it from other Mexican-American Spanish speech variet- ies are (1) its use of a sonorous drawl, (2) its exclusive use of the formal, rather than the informal, verb forms of Spanish, and (3) its heavy reli- ance on gestures and signs (Barker 1975a, p. 185). More interesting than its characteristic features, however, are its social functions and its value for the social group which regularly uses it. Coltharp (1965, pp. 31–32) finds that the argot provides the group members with protection (in its unintelligibility to both English and Spanish speakers alike)—protection from police reprisals or from betrayal by informants, and in correctional institutions, as a cover for illegal or immoral activities. Interestingly, the argot provides protection to nongang members as well, at least in El Paso. There, nonmembers "knowingly learn and use the language as an

93

identification with the group so that they will not suffer physical harm at the hands of the unlawful element" (Coltharp 1965, p. 31). Barker (1975a), on the other hand, sees Pachuco as fulfilling two other social functions:

The first and basic of these is its function as the private language of groups of boys who find themselves not fully accepted in either American or Mexican society. As such, Pachuco transmits a set of values which runs counter to the accepted social order and tends to isolate the users from the type of social contacts which would assist their assimilation into American life. . . . The second function of Pachuco is as a symbol of sophistication among members of the younger generation. In this use it may be compared to the jive-talk of some teen-age Americans. (Pp. 200–1)

While Pachuco is a class-related argot (used as a regular means of communication only among working-class boys), neither in Tucson nor in El Paso is its use restricted to lower-class speakers. Thus, Barker (1975a, p. 199) discovers the use of Pachuco expressions as a mark of sophistication among Mexican-American boys of all social classes; similarly, Coltharp (1965, p. 32) sees the spread of the argot both geographically (to other sections of the El Paso area) and socially (its use has been heard among prosperous people, in places frequented exclusively by such people, although only isolated words here and there are made use of). Finally, Pachuco is a male language. The only females who use it are the prostitutes of the barrio or the girl friends of gang members (Coltharp 1965, p. 32; see, for an example of a male-female Pachuco conversation, Coltharp 1970).

The use of Pachuco argot presents, as well, some interesting points taken from the perspective of the ethnography of speaking. In her ethnographic overview of the Pachuco speech community, Coltharp (1965, pp. 19–20) sees talking as a value per se: "Perhaps because very few have enough to eat—or to cover their nakedness—the groups seem to be skilled in spending time and not money by talking. . . . The constant talk, talk, talk of the members of the group is a measure of their values." Humor is highly valued among the Tirilones of El Paso and language is used to induce hilarity (Coltharp 1965, p. 20), which is provoked by means of such verbal devices as neologisms or new turns of a phrase. For instance, any comments that are made about a passing female are a source of laughter. So, too, are noises made with the mouth, or with the mouth and hand. Elimination is a subject that is automatically a cause for laughter. One topic of conversation that produces highly elaborate linguistic innovation is the sex act; as a topic, it is the source of creative language. Coltharp is not unaware of the parallels between this

94

sort of creativity in the speech of the Tirilones and that of inner-city black English-speakers (Coltharp 1965, p. 20).

THE ENGLISH OF MEXICAN AMERICANS

Very little has been written about the English of Mexican Americans, bilingual or otherwise, and within what has been written, there is disagreement. The discord stems largely from the fact that investigators come from diverse theoretical backgrounds, each with its own set of criteria. Thus, Lance (1972, p. 35), whose orientation is linguistic, considers the English of bilinguals to be a "distinctive variety of *English*—a dialect—rather than . . . a hodgepodge of forms that illustrate interference phenomena." Sawyer (1975, p. 78), on the other hand, in her analysis of Spanish-English bilingualism in San Antonio, takes a second language acquisitional stance and contends that the English spoken by Mexican American bilinguals ("Latins") in San Antonio is not a dialect of English, but rather, "an imperfect state in the mastery of English."

Lastra de Suárez (1975), who comes from a more sociolinguistic background, reports that the phonology is characterized by an intonation similar to that of Spanish; high vowels in words such as "here," "think," and "too"; centralization of the low front vowel ("lamp"); the voiced bilabial fricative ("over," "I live"); affrication of the palatal fricative ([č] in "shades"); the intervocalic allophone of /t/ and /d/[12] is too apical ("lettuce"); dentalization of the alveolar nasal in final position ("readin' " instead of "reading"); and simplification of consonant clusters ("pitchers" rather than "pictures"). In the area of syntax she includes nonstandard forms, some of which display Spanish interference, but some of which are characteristic of non-Spanish influenced nonstandard English (p. 66). Examples of the latter are double negatives ("You don't do nothing"), repetition of the indirect complement ("I like them big whales"), repetition of the subject ("My mother, she doesn't have a job"); examples of the former are misplaced adverbs of time ("We all the time used to go outside"), lack of concord ("She stays home and work"), past instead of the infinitive ("I used to threw the ball"), and confusing the gerund with the infinitive ("I like to doing math").

Cornejo (1973), writing in a language developmental framework, analyzes the speech of five-year-old bilingual children in Texas, and comes to a similar conclusion: most of the nonstandard phonological and grammatical forms are caused by interference from Spanish, but a number are nonstandard forms of English dialects. Instances of the former are reduction of initial consonant clusters such as *sp*, *st*, *sl*, and *sk*

95

("store," "estor"; "spoon," "espuwn"), probably best considered a re-distribution of these clusters across syllable boundaries; reduction of final consonant clusters ("diamond," "day∂m∂n"); shifting of primary stress ("bicycle," "biysíykol"); and phonemic alternation (Θ > t, three > triy). Examples of the latter are elimination of the verbal copula ("he goin to play") and omission of a weak stressed syllable preceding the primary stress (because > cause).

Probably the most comprehensive and systematic analysis of the English of Mexican Americans is that of Cohen (1976). In a longitudinal study covering a two-year span, Cohen studies both the Spanish and the English of two groups of Chicano students (grades K–2) in Redwood City, California, one of which has been participating in a bilingual edu-cation project, and the other of which has been attending an all-English school program. Looking for deviations from "school language," that is to say, the standard spoken dialect, he classifies deviations into three categories: (1) child language, (2) nonstandard dialect, and (3) language interference. Examples of each would be: (1) He *gots* an old hat on; (2) The lady's carrying *them* guys; (3) That boy want _____ go home (for a complete listing of the specific types of grammatical deviations, see Cohen 1976, pp. 129–30).

Obviously there are many kinds of deviations that might be con-sidered to overlap into two categories, and Cohen is very sensitive to this possibility. For example, in the sentence, "There was a lady carrying *his* baby," Cohen (p. 134) accounts for the deviant gender of the pro-noun with the dual explanation that "Native English-speaking children have trouble keeping their antecedents straight," but interference from Spanish may also be playing a role in that Spanish has one pronominal form in the genitive case (*su*) reflecting both genders, whereas English has two. However, some grammatical deviations found by Cohen do not fit into his tripartite classificatory scheme and remain problematical for him (e.g., the deletion of the relative pronoun "who" or "that" after a "there's" construction as in "There's a little boy _____ has a book"). Nevertheless, such an anomalous case is the exception to Cohen's generally classifiable examples, and his acute awareness of the not-so-clearcut nature of grammatical deviations among children is in itself a significant finding, as is its implication.

Of course, there is the problem of what to call child language as opposed to nonstandard dialect. Some forms are clearly both. There is also a grey area between child language and interference. A form may not seem native-like and yet cannot be traced to some pattern in the other language which is causing interference. In this study, it was assumed that such a form might be used by a native speaker of the language at some early stage of his development. Another

approach is to say that these errors are developmental but characteristic of *non*-native learners of the language. . . . However, the approach ignores the language acquisition patterns of the native learner and assumes, and perhaps accentuates, a difference between the problems of first- and second-language acquisition for young children. The Redwood City findings suggest that for young children, first- and second-language acquisition problems may be quite similar. (Cohen, p. 161)

Out of this study comes the conclusion that, for the Mexican-American children sampled, "child language accounted for most deviations in English, but interference from Spanish came in a close second, with nonstandard dialect substantially behind" (p. 163).

Whereas all the writers mentioned above point to the nonstandard (Spanish-influenced or otherwise) English spoken by Mexican Americans, Sawyer (1975) presents an interesting counterpoint. Her San Antonio bilinguals demonstrated a competence in the "unnatural, regionless, *formal* style of the classroom" in contrast to the regional (South and South Midland) English spoken in San Antonio by Anglos. Her explanation of this phenomenon is the social isolation of Mexican-Americans from the Anglo culture, which forced them to learn English primarily from school and books, rather than through meaningful contact with English speakers. Thus, words familiar to Anglos, which are transmitted orally from generation to generation, are not known by Mexican Americans; e.g., *light bread* ("white bread"), *clabber* ("curdled milk"), and *pully bone* ("wish bone"). Also reflecting the cultural situation is the rejection by Mexican Americans of words borrowed from Spanish, such that an important group of words that are considered to be part of the region's Spanish cultural heritage (*patio, bronco, arroyo, mesa, alamo, burro, plaza,* and *frijoles*) are completely rejected for use in English (Sawyer 1975, p. 95).

THE INFLUENCE OF SPANISH ON THE ENGLISH OF THE SOUTHWEST

Numerous articles have described the lexical impact of Spanish on English, the direct result of the two languages being in contact in the Southwest (Adkins 1968; Braddy 1955, 1956; Gray et al. 1949; Sawyer 1959; Shulman 1949; Sorvig 1953). In Braddy's (1955) account of the narcotic argot along the Mexican border, there is obviously a heavy impact of Spanish on an otherwise English-based speech variety, notably on words referring to narcotics themselves (*cruz*, "opium"; *Doña Juanita*, "marijuana"; *hache*, "heroin"; *leño*, "a marijuana cigarette"; *sedol*, "morphine"; *yesca*, "marijuana"). Braddy's (1956) article on the smuggler's argot in the Southwest comes to a similar conclusion, namely

97

that the English argot receives a heavy dose of Spanish (and, interest-ingly, is used by both Anglo and Mexican-American smugglers), ex-amples of which are *burros, mulas* (men who wade the river with contra-band goods strapped to their backs), *choto* (policeman), and *perdidas* (objects of smuggling).

Adkins (1968) seems to be off-target in her analysis of reverse borrowings of English corruptions of Spanish. She is surprised at the borrowing of Spanish speakers of what are currently English words originally of Spanish origin. If Mexican-American Spanish speakers use "savvy" (Span. *saber*, to understand), "hoosegow" (*juzgado*, judged), or "lariat" (*la reata*, rope), it is because they are probably unaware of the etymology of these now English words.

Gray et al. (1949) present an interesting piece on the slang used at the University of Arizona, which, at the time the article was written, consisted of a combination of English vernacular and acceptable Spanish pronunciation. They classify the expressions into two types: those based on mispronunciations, called "gringoisms" ([næd∂]) for [nad∂], [heist∂ m∂næn∂] for [ast∂m∂njan∂]), and those based on direct pronunciation and translation from Spanish (*Adió*, a term of incredulity, "you don't say"; *Qué hubo le?*, "How goes it?"; *borracho*, drunk). What is puzzling is the authors' use of schwa in the supposedly Spanish pronunciation of the first category of expressions; it would seem that all the schwas should be low front vowels.

Sawyer (1959), in another interesting piece on the San Antonio bilingual speech situation, demonstrates the aloofness of English from Spanish influence. The evidence she gathers reveals that ". . . English in San Antonio has not been affected by Spanish in phonology, mor-phology or syntax; and although a number of Spanish words are found in the speech of the oldest informants, they are words of extensive spread throughout the Southwest, so that we find no evidence that Spanish contact in San Antonio is even responsible for additions to the lexicon of San Antonio English" (p. 280). She notes, however, that the presence of Spanish loans in the speech of the oldest informants indi-cates that in an earlier period, Spanish-speakers in the area held a more equal status with Anglos; today, Spanish is of low status in San Antonio.

CODE-SWITCHING

Code-switching as a commonplace phenomenon among bilingual Mexi-can-Americans has been well-documented (Cardenas 1972; Espinosa 1975; Gumperz 1970, 1974; Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. 1971a, 1971b;

Jacobson 1978; Lance 1975b; Ornstein 1972, 1974; Peñalosa 1975; Red-linger 1977; Reyes 1976; Timm 1975; Trager and Valdez 1937; Valdés-Fallis 1975). Unfortunately, it has remained an exceptionally unanalyzed sphere of linguistic behavior, for only Gumperz and Gumperz in collaboration with Hernández-Ch. treat it with scholarly seriousness. Lance (1975b), for example, who does deal exclusively with the subject, merely presents many examples of it, finding no pattern to the switching, and calling it "willy-nilly." Ornstein (1972, p. 74) contributes to our understanding of the phenomenon by pointing out its pervasiveness: "code-switching, except in the most formal contexts with monolingual English interlocutors, is the rule rather than the exception, occurring seemingly at both subconscious and conscious levels." Redlinger (1977, pp. 104–5) adds some valuable empirical data on the subject as part of her analysis of the bilingual language development in preschool Mexican-American children. She finds that children who reportedly switch codes the most are those who have shifted from a balanced bilingualism to a Spanish dominance, and that balanced bilingualism is strongly associated with a lack of code-switching. As for adult code-switching, Redlinger finds that although the mothers of all children except those characterized by Spanish dominance report a great deal of code-switching on their part, most fathers, in sharp contrast, report a low incidence of it in their behavior.

Clearly, Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. is one of the earliest systematic investigations of Mexican-American code-switching. It should be pointed out, however, that all four of the articles (Gumperz 1970, 1974; Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. 1971a, 1971b) are virtually reprints of one another. If any one were to be recommended over the others, it would be Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. (1971a), "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism and Classroom Interaction," since it is the only one in which material has not been deleted. This particular version is reprinted under the same title elsewhere (Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. 1971c).

Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. are quick to note that not all instances of Spanish words in an otherwise English sentence are necessarily cases of code-switching. For example, sentences prefaced with expressions like *andale pues* (O.K., swell), are part of the bilingual's normal style of English, and are used by Mexican-Americans only when speaking to other Mexican Americans. In this capacity, "They serve as stylistic ethnic identity markers and are frequently used by speakers who no longer have effective control of both languages" (Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. 1971a, p. 318). Other such ethnic identity markers are loan word nouns such as *chicano*, *gabacho* (an anglified Mexican Ameri-

99

can), and *pocho* (low-class Mexican American), and primarily exclamations and sentence connectors (e.g., *no hombre*, "why, no"; *pues*, "well," "then").

Most cases of true code-switching involve the insertion of entire sentences into the other language, sentence modifiers or phrases being much less prone to borrowing. In general, elements that can be switched are (1) noun qualifiers, (2) verb complements, (3) parts of a noun phrase, and (4) the predicate part of an equational sentence (Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. 1971a, p. 320). Examples of each would be the following:

(1) . . . those friends are friends from Mexico que tienen chamaquitos.
(2) . . . that has nothing to do con que le hagan esta . . .
(3) The type of work he did cuando trabajaba he . . . what . . . that I remember, era regidor at one time.
(4) An' my uncle Sam es el mas agabachado.

Perhaps the most valuable contribution to the subject of Mexican-American code-switching is the Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. (1971a, pp. 320–25) analysis of its social meaning. They are able to isolate a number of factors that together comprise this social meaning, among them: (1) difficulty in finding the right word, or the readier recall of some items of experience, referents, or topics, in one language than the other; (2) the linguistic need for psychological terminology or expressions ("pacify," "relax") causes a switching to English, whereas ideas and experiences having to do with one's Spanish-speaking past produce a switch into Spanish; (3) English is used "to introduce most new information, while Spanish provides stylistic embroidering to amplify the speaker's intent," the latter taking the form of "pre-coded, stereotyped or idiomatic phrases" (p. 323); (4) Spanish is used for quoting persons whose Mexican-American identity is being emphasized, and English is used when talking *about* them, rather than for direct quotation of them; (5) Spanish is used to emphasize the ethnic identity of the referent; and (6) Spanish reflects personal involvement while English is used for more general or detached statements.

In general, code-switching is found to occur only so long as all persons involved in the conversation are Mexican American, and the conversation deals with personal experience. Interestingly, Gumperz and Hernández-Ch. (1971b, p. 124) consider code-switching to be a behavioral strategy similar to the use of polite and familiar forms of address in many societies so that "English forms ordinarily associated with non-members, i.e., non-*chicanos*, are like high-status pronouns, in that they convey formality or distance when used to refer to members, while customarily forms used among members, i.e., *chicanos*, are like

100

familiar pronouns, in that they convey secondary meanings of solidarity and confidentiality."

Valdés-Fallis (1975), in her analysis of bilingual Chicano poetry, finds evidence in support of previous research. She corroborates Fishman's finding that code-switching varies depending on the extent to which a bilingual is dominant in either of his languages. She also confirms Gumperz and Blom's (1972) finding that a switch from one language to another can signal a different domain or situation, and that it occurs, in addition, for metaphorical purposes (e.g., for emphasis or contrast). Finally, she finds supporting evidence for Lance's (1975b) and Barker's (1975a) thesis that switching will occur when a bilingual finds he/she can express a given phrase better in one language than in the other. Perhaps the only weakness of Valdés-Fallis' work is that its conclusions are based on writing rather than speech, and the particular genre of writing is even more deliberate and less spontaneous than student compositions, another frequent source of linguistic data.

A useful article that helps distinguish, in a more refined manner, between code-switching and borrowing is Reyes (1976). Reyes admits that he is not the first to refine Weinreich's (1968) inadequate definition of interference,[13] but his definitions are helpful in clarifying the confusion regarding the presence of English in Spanish sentences. Reyes' defining characteristics of code-switching are (1) the presence of a change from Spanish to English occurs at a clearly discernible syntactic juncture, and (2) the English component of the mixed sentence has its own internal syntactic structure. These contrast with borrowing, in which the English component of the sentence consists of a single lexical item. Borrowing in turn can be of two types: "spontaneous," whereby "the English component of the mixed sentence occurs within a special Chicano syntactic frame and it depends on this frame for its inflectional interpretation" (Reyes, 1976, p. 183), as in, "Hizo improve mucho"; and "incorporated," whereby "the English component is adapted phonologically and morphologically to the norms of the Spanish language," as in "Taipeo las cartas."

While Reyes makes an attempt to discover the syntactic conditions that govern code-switching, Timm (1975) focuses on that as her target of research. She finds that one of the strongest restrictions on switching are pronominal subjects of objects and the finite verbs to which they are linked (e.g., the subjects Timm interviewed found the following sentences totally impossible: *Yo went, *He quiere, *She sees lo). A second restriction on switching is the position between finite verbs and their infinite complements (e.g., *quieren to come, *(they)

101

want a venir). Third, verb phrases that contain auxiliaries and main verbs usually occur only in unilingual constructions (e.g., *(I) must esperar, *debo wait). Fourth, in the negation of a verb, the negative element must be in the same language as the verb undergoing negation (e.g., *(I) do not quiero, *(I no want)). And lastly, in regard to noun phrases, switching is permissible within certain kinds of NPs (DET N),[14] but switching is more restricted in longer NPs containing an adjective (D+A+N or D+N+A) (e.g., *su favorito spot, *his favorite lugar). The only thing one might question regarding Timm's work is the overall validity of the data given the skewed nature of her sample (a one-hour long taped conversation with a New Mexican elderly woman, a six-page short story written by three Mexican-American university students, plus the responses of three bilingual students who rated the test sentences for switching potentiality).

Sanchez' (1972) study, based on a better sample, also is insightful in providing information on the syntactic constraints on code-switching, although some of her examples (e.g., switching within a noun phrase, "el wedding") would be considered by Reyes not to be code-switching at all, but rather, borrowing. And rather than trying to discover the constructions in which switching is restricted, she focuses instead on those in which switching is permissible. Essentially, she deals with nouns modified by adjectives or adjectival clauses ("The most beautiful thing que nos ha pasado"), predicate adjectives and predicate nouns ("Me quede surprised"), verbs in the progressive ("Te están brain-washing"), periphrastic constructions with *ir* + infinitive ("Si va take una muchacha el dominant role"), and prepositional phrases ("Siempre ando con hate").

The recent research of Jacobson (1978) also contributes to our knowledge of linguistic constraints on intra-sentential code-switching. His findings, in summary, are that, "the co-occurrence of elements from two languages seems to be favored when entire phrases or clauses are unilingual. Conjunctions, on the other hand, are often conceived of as independent constituents and can occur in one language while the remainder of the clause occurs in the other. All this suggests that constraints do exist but mainly when the constituent structure is broken into units below the phrase level" (p. 232).

More developed than his purely linguistic treatment, however, is his psycho-sociolinguistic analysis. Jacobson points to three psycho-linguistic factors that have been singled out by other scholars, all of which bear on code-switching practices: (1) the time of acquisition of a second language, and the type of bilinguality achieved; (2) the encoding and decoding strategies of code-switching bilinguals, and (3) attitudes

102

held toward code-switching. He notes as well the sociolinguistic factors related to code-switching that have been uncovered by others: the social situation, the norms of interaction, domains, cultural heritage, ethnicity, and acculturation. Jacobson's own contribution to code-switching is his attempt at the formulation of theory. He distinguishes between what he calls "semicode-switching" and "true code-switching," the latter term comprising code-switching that is either psychologically or sociologically conditioned. Each of the three categories in turn is broken down into subcategories. Unfortunately, some of the subcategories are incompletely thought out and in need of further analysis. Thus, one category of semicode-switching, "access," designates a switching under the condition where a lexical item in the other language is more easily accessible. This very notion is difficult to validate, since verification of its having been in operation can only be ascertained by the subsequent questioning of a speaker. Similarly, the psychologically conditioned subcategory "preference" is poorly conceptualized. To say that "a respondent merely felt more inclined toward using a language other than the one in which he was addressed" (p. 242) is to fail to account for the switch. In addition, it seems incorrect to assert that the subcategory "domain" can "trigger" a switch from one language to another in the sense of intra- or even inter-sentential code-switching. Rather, it is accurate to say that one language is used to a greater extent in some domains than in others. Finally, the examples given by Jacobson to demonstrate that switching occurs according to the interpersonal relations among speakers (e.g., mother/child, husband/wife) seem merely to tap the language dominance of the speakers involved.

CONCLUSIONS

This review of the sociolinguistic literature on the Chicano speech community has intended to demonstrate that any simplistic description of the verbal resources of Mexican Americans would be inadequate and a distortion of the complex reality. Just as Chicanos as a social group are heterogenous, so too, are their linguistic means. Their Spanish alone is marked by internal developmental features, archaisms, anglicisms, *pachuquismos*, and geographical variations. When it alternates with English inter- and intra-sententially in the form of code-switching, it may be thought of as forming part of an additional speaking style, one constrained by social, psychological, and purely linguistic factors. Thus, any comments concerning Chicanos as a social and linguistic group ought to take into account all the subtleties of the existing situation, as research to date has so clearly brought to light.

103

NOTES

1. In reaction to the predominant approach to linguistics that until his time had been philological, or historical, in nature, in the first decade of the twentieth century the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure emphasized the need for linguistic description to focus on a language as it exists at a given point in time. Such "synchronic" analysis was to be kept strictly separate from any historical, or "diachronic," analysis, which strives to describe a language as it changes over time. For his insistence on keeping apart the two analytical approaches, de Saussure is credited with shaping twentieth-century descriptive linguistics, as it was practiced in Europe and America up until the 1950s. The linguistic theory of transformational-generative grammar, as formulated by Noam Chomsky, was to challenge that sharp synchronic/diachronic methodological dichotomy.
2. Three groups emerge: natives of native parents, natives of foreign or mixed parents, and the foreign-born.
3. For example, California is the most prosperous area, even for Anglos, whereas southern Colorado and northern New Mexico are depressed areas, economically similar to Appalachia; educational differences also appear by region, such that the schooling gap between Spanish surname and Anglo adults in 1960 was 6.7 years in Texas, but only 3.6 in California.
4. For instance, the educational gap between Spanish surname and Anglo adults was 9 years in Lubbock, Texas, whereas the gap was only 2.3 years in Colorado Springs (Grebler et al. 1970, p. 32).
5. *La Raza* is defined as "a special kind of unity of all Mexican Americans who are united by cultural and spiritual bonds derived from God," and the use of Spanish is the primary symbol of loyalty to La Raza (Skrabanek 1970, p. 280).
6. Some might consider this an oversimplification of the definition of stable bilingualism. A more accurate characterization of this notion would encompass the stable use of one language in some domains, and of the second language in others.
7. In 1967 one network hooked in with a Mexican network, and there existed two American stations, in Los Angeles and San Antonio, and five border stations.
8. "Morphophonemics" refers to the class of phonemes (i.e., minimal units of sound that distinguish one word from another in a language, e.g., /p/ and /b/ are phonemes of English because they distinguish "pit" from "bit") that belong to the same morpheme (i.e., meaningful linguistic unit that has no smaller parts, such as *-ness*, *child*, *un-*). Thus, a morphophonemic statement would be the following: the three most common forms of the English plural suffix are {-s, -z, -ɨz}, as "kits," "kids," and "kisses," respectively.
9. "Metaphony," often used interchangeably with the word "umlaut," refers to the change of a vowel caused by partial assimilation to a succeeding sound.
10. "Juncture" refers to a transition between two consecutive sounds in speech. Thus, the reply to question 1 below has a juncture (represented by a plus sign) between "sham" and "rock," whereas "shamrock" has no such juncture:
     1. "Is it a real rock?" "No, it's a sham rock."
     2. "Is it a daisy?" "No, it's a shamrock."
11. The fact that the stop sound [b] and the fricative [b] are in "complementary distribution" means that each occurs in a phonetic environment where the other does not. Thus, in standard Mexican Spanish [b] occurs in absolute-initial position, i.e., after a pause at the beginning of a phonemic phrase, and directly following [m], whereas [b] occurs in all other positions. Consequently, [b] and [b] would be considered to be allophones of the same phoneme. The sound [v], however, is not considered an allophone of standard Mexican Spanish.
12. When /t/ and /d/ occur between vowels (as in "latter" and "ladder"), they are often pronounced by monolingual English speakers as a "flap" sound, similar to the flapped /r/ of Spanish (as in *para*).

13. Weinreich (1968) defines interference as "those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e., as a result of languages in contact" (p. 370).
14. Grammatical categories are abbreviated as follows: noun phrase = NP, determiner = DET, or merely D; noun = N; adjective = A.

REFERENCES

ADKINS, PATRICIA G.
  1968 "Reverse Borrowings of English Corruptions of Spanish." *The Speech Teacher* 17 (Nov.):331–33.
ALATIS, JAMES E. (ED.)
  1970 *Report on the Twenty-First Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
BARKER, GEORGE C.
  1975a "Social Functions of Language in a Mexican-American Community." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
  1975b "Pachuco: An American-Spanish Argot and Its Social Function in Tucson, Arizona." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
BELTRAMO, ANTHONY AND ANTONIO DE PORCEL
  1975 "Some Lexical Characteristics of San José Spanish." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
BILLS, GARLAND P.
  1974 *Southwest Areal Linguistics*. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism, San Diego State University.
BOWEN, J. DONALD
  1954 "English Loan Words in Spanish." *Hispania* 37 (Sept.):329–30.
  1972 "Local Standards and Spanish in the Southwest." In Ewton and Ornstein, 1972.
  1975 "Adaptation of English Borrowing." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
BOWEN, J. DONALD AND JACOB ORNSTEIN
  1976 *Studies in Southwest Spanish*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.
BRADDY, HALDEEN
  1955 "Narcotic Argot along the Mexican Border." *American Speech* 30 (May):84–90.
  1956 "Smugglers' Argot in the Southwest." *American Speech* 31 (May):96–101.
BRISK, MARIA ESTELA
  1974 "A Preliminary Study of the Syntax of Five-Year-Old Speakers of New Mexico." *Linguistics* 128:69–78.
BURMA, JOHN H. (ED.)
  1970a "Introduction." In Burma, 1970b.
  1970b *Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc.
  1970c "A Comparison of the Mexican American Subculture with the Oscar Lewis Culture of Poverty Model." In Burma, 1970b.
CARDENAS, DANIEL N.
  1972 "Compound and Coordinate Bilingualism." In Ewton and Ornstein, 1972.
  1975 "Mexican Spanish." In Hernández-Chávez et al.

CARRANZA, M. A.
 1976 "Language Attitudes and other Cultural Attitudes of Mexican American Parents: Some Sociological Implications." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame.
CHRISTIAN, CHESTER C. JR.
 1970 "The Analysis of Linguistic and Cultural Differences: A Proposed Model." In Alatis.
 1972 "Language Functions in the Maintenance of Socio-Economic Hierarchies." In Ewton and Ornstein, 1972.
 1973 "Criteria for Cultural-Linguistic Subdivision in the Southwest." In Turner.
CHRISTIAN, CHESTER C. JR. AND JANE MACNAMB CHRISTIAN
 1966 "Spanish Language and Culture in the Southwest." In Fishman.
COHEN, ANDREW D.
 1975 "Assessing Language Maintenance in Spanish-Speaking Communities in the Southwest." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
 1976 "The English and Spanish Grammar of Chicano Primary School Students." In Bowen and Ornstein.
COLTHARP, LURLINE
 1965 *The Tongue of the Tirilones: A Linguistics Study of a Criminal Argot*. University: University of Alabama Press.
 1970 "Invitation to the Dance: Spanish in the El Paso Underworld." In Glenn G. Gilbert, ed., *Texas Studies in Bilingualism*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
CORNEJO, RICARDO J.
 1973 "The Acquisition of Lexicon in the Speech of Bilingual Children." In Turner.
ESPINOSA, AURELIO M.
 1975 "Speech Mixture in New Mexico: The Influence of the English Language on New Mexican Spanish." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
ESPINOSA, JR., AURELIO M.
 1975 "Problemas lexicográficos del Español del Sudoeste." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
EWTON, RALPH W. AND JACOB ORNSTEIN
 1970 *Studies in Language and Linguistics, 1969–1970*. El Paso: Texas Western Press.
 1972 *Studies in Language and Linguistics, 1972–73*. El Paso: Texas Western Press.
FISHMAN, JOSHUA A.
 1966 *Language Loyalty in the United States: By American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague: Mouton.
FITZ-GERALD, JOHN D.
 1921 "The Bilingual-Biracial Problem of our Border States." *Hispania* 4 (May):175–86.
GARCIA, ERNEST
 1975 "Chicano Spanish Dialects and Education." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
GINGRAS, ROSARIO
 1974 "Problems in the Description of Spanish-English Intra-sentential Code-Switching." In Bills.

106

GONZALEZ, GUSTAVO
  1975 "The Acquisition of Grammatical Structures by Mexican-American
        Children." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
GRAY, HOLLIS, VIRGINIA JONES, PATRICIA PARKER AND ALEX SMITH
  1949 "Gringoisms in Arizona." *American Speech* 24:234–36.
GREBLER, LEO, JOAN W. MOORE AND RALPH C. GUZMAN
  1970 *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New
        York: The Free Press.
GUMPERZ, JOHN J.
  1970 "Verbal Strategies in Multilingual Communication." In Alatis.
  1974 "Communication in Multilingual Societies." In Frank Pialorsi, ed.,
        Teaching the Bilingual New Methods and Old Traditions. Tucson: University
        of Arizona Press.
GUMPERZ, JOHN J. AND JAN-PETER BLOM
  1972 "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code-Switching in Norway."
        In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds., *Directions in Sociolinguistics*.
        New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
GUMPERZ, JOHN J. AND EDUARDO HERNÁNDEZ-CHÁVEZ
  1971a "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism and Classroom Interaction." In Gumperz,
        Language in Social Groups: Essays by John Gumperz. Stanford: Stanford
        University Press.
  1971b "Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication." In W. H. Whiteley,
        ed., *Language Use and Social Change: Problems of Multilingualism with Spe-
        cial Reference to Eastern Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.
  1971c "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism and Classroom Interaction." In C. B.
        Cortney, V. P. Cazden, John and D. Hymes, eds. *The Functions of Lan-
        guage in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
HARVEY, GINA CANTONI AND M. F. HEISER (EDS.)
  1975 *Southwest Languages and Linguistics in Educational Perspective*. San Diego,
        Calif.: San Diego State University, School of Education.
HAUGEN, EINAR
  1970 "Dialinguistics." In James E. Alatis, ed., *Bilingualism and Language Con-
        tact: Anthropological, Psychological and Sociological Aspects*. Washington,
        D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
HENDRICKSON, R. H.
  1973 "Pygmalion Revisited." Abstract of a paper presented at Conference on
        California English, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, 31
        March.
HENSEY, FRITZ
  1973 "Grammatical Variables in Southwestern American Spanish." *Linguis-
        tics* 108 (July):5–26.
HERNÁNDEZ-CHÁVEZ, EDUARDO, ANDREW D. COHEN AND ANTHONY F. BELTRAMO
  1975 *El Lenguaje de los Chicanos: Regional and Social Characteristics of Language
        Used by Mexican Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Lin-
        guistics.
HINOJOS, FRANCISCO G.
  1975 "Notes on the Pachuco: Stereotypes, History and Dialect." *Atisbos*
        (Summer):53–61.

HOFFER, BATES L. AND JACOB ORNSTEIN
  1974 *Sociolinguistics in the Southwest*. San Antonio, Texas: University of San
        Antonio.
JACOBSON, RODOLFO
  1978 "The Social Implications of Intra-Sentential Code-Switching." In
        Ricardo Romo and Raymund Paredes, eds., *New Directions in Chicano
        Scholarship*. San Diego, Cal.: Chicano Studies Monograph Series, Uni-
        versity of California.
LAMBERT, WALLACE E.
  1967 "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism." *The Journal of Social Issues*
        23:91–109.
LAMBERT, WALLACE E., MOSHE ANISFELD, AND GRACE YENI-KOMSHIAN
  1965 "Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arab Adolescents to Dialect and
        Language Variation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2:84–90.
LAMBERT, WALLACE E., HANNAH FRANKEL, AND G. R. TUCKER
  1966 "Judging Personality through Speech: A French-Canadian Example."
        The Journal of Communications 4:305–21.
LANCE, DONALD M.
  1969 *A Brief Study of Spanish-English Bilingualism: Final Report, Research Project
        ORR-Liberal Arts-15504*. College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University.
  1972 "The Codes of the Spanish-English Bilingual." In Bernard Spolsky, ed.,
        The Language Education of Minority Children: Selected Readings. Rowley,
        Mass.: Newbury House Publications.
  1975a "Dialectal and Nonstandard Forms in Texas Spanish." In Hernández-
        Chávez et al.
  1975b "Spanish-English Code Switching." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
LASTRA DE SUÁREZ, YOLANDA
  1975 "El habla y la educación de los niños de orígen mexicano en Los
        Angeles." In Hernández-Chávez et al.
LOPEZ, RONALD W. AND DARRYL D. ENOS
  1973 "Spanish-Language-Only Television in Los Angeles County." *Aztlan* 4
        (Fall):283–14.
MACKEY, WILLIAM F.
  1970 "Interference, Integration and the Synchronic Fallacy." In Alatis.
MALLÓ, JERÓNIMO
  1954 "La Plaga de los Anglicismos." *Hispania* 37 (May):135–40.
METCALF, ALLAN A.
  1974 "The Study of California Chicano English." *Linguistics* 28 (May):53–58.
MURPHY, PAUL R.
  1974 "Interference, Integration and Verbal Repertoire." *Linguistics* 128:59–67.
ORNSTEIN, JACOB
  1970 "Sociolinguistics and New Perspectives in the Study of Southwest
        Spanish." In Ewton and Ornstein, 1970.
  1972 "Toward a Classification of Southwest Spanish Nonstandard Variants."
        Linguistics 93:70–87.
  1974 "Mexican-American Sociolinguistics: A Well-Kept Scholarly and Public
        Secret." In Hoffer and Ornstein.
  1975 "The Archaic and the Modern in the Spanish of New Mexico." In
        Hernández-Chávez et al.

108

ORTEGO, PHIL
    1974 "On Sociolinguistics and Language Attitudinal Change." In Hoffer and
          Ornstein.

ORTIZ, CARMELITA LOUISE
    1949 "English Influence on the Spanish of Tampa." *Hispania* 32 (Aug.):300–
          04.

PEÑALOSA, FERNANDO
    1970 "The Changing Mexican American in Southern California." In Burma
          (ed.), 1970b.
    1975a "Chicano Multilingualism and Multiglossia." In Hernández-Chávez et
          al.
    1975b "Sociolinguistic Theory and the Chicano Community." *Aztlan* 6, no. 1
          (Spring):1–11.

PHILLIPS, ROBERT H., JR.
    1972 "The Influence of English on the /v/ in Los Angeles Spanish." In Ewton
          and Ornstein, 1972.
    1975 "Variations in Los Angeles Spanish Phonology." In Hernández-Chávez
          et al.

POST, ANITA C.
    1933 "Some Aspects of Arizona Spanish." *Hispania* 16 (Feb.–Mar.):35–42.

POULTER, VIRGIL L.
    1970 "Comparisons of Voiceless Stops in the English and Spanish of Biling-
          ual Natives of Fort Worth-Dallas." In Glenn G. Gilbert, ed., *Texas
          Studies in Bilingualism*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

RAEL, JUAN B.
    1975 "Associative Interference in New Mexican Spanish." In Hernández-
          Chávez et al.

REDLINGER, WENDY E.
    1975 "Mothers' Speech to Children in Bilingual Mexican-American Homes."
          In Betty Lou Dubois and Isabel Crouch, eds., *The Sociology of the Lan-
          guages of American Women*. San Antonio, Texas: Trinity University Press.
    1977 "Bilingual Language Development in Preschool Mexican American
          Children." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona.

REYES, ROGELIO
    1976 "Language Mixing in Chicano Bilingual Speech." In Bowen and Orns-
          tein, 1976.

RUBEL, ARTHUR J.
    1970 "The Family." In Burma, 1970b.

RYAN, ELLEN BOUCHARD AND MIQUEL A. CARRANZA
    1976– "Attitudes toward Accented English." *Atisbos* (Winter):27–34.
    1977

SÁNCHEZ, ROSAURA
    1972 "Nuestra circunstancia lingüística." *El Grito* 6:45–74.

SAVILLE-TROIKE, MURIEL
    1976 "Bilingual Children: A Resource Document." In Francesco Cordasco,
          ed., *Bilingual Schooling in the United States: A Sourcebook for Educational
          Personnel*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

SAWYER, JANET B.
    1959 "Aloofness from Spanish Influence in Texas English." *Word* 15
          (Aug.):270–81.

1975 ''Spanish-English Bilingualism in San Antonio, Texas.'' In Hernández-Chávez et al.

SCHULMAN, DAVID
1949 ''Some California Contributions to the American Vocabulary.'' *American Speech* 24 (Dec.):264–67.

SKRABANEK, R. L.
1970 ''Language Maintenance among Mexican-Americans.'' *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 11 (Dec.):272–82.

SOLÉ, YOLANDA R.
1975 ''Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Texas Spanish and the Teaching of the Standard Language.'' In Harvey and Heiser.

SORVIG, RALPH V.
1953 ''Southwestern Plant Names from Spanish.'' *American Speech* 28 (Feb.):97–105.

SPOLSKY, BERNARD
1969 ''Attitudinal Aspects of Second Language Learning.'' *Language Learning* 19, nos. 3, 4, pp. 271–85.
1972 *The Language Education of Minority Children: Selected Readings*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

THOMPSON, ROGER M.
1974 ''Mexican American Language Loyalty and the Validity of the 1970 Census.'' *Linguistics* 28:7–18.

TIMM, L. A.
1975 ''Spanish-English Code-Switching: El Porque y How-Not-To.'' *Romance Philology* 23:473–82.

TOVAR, INEZ
1974 ''The Changing Attitudes of *La Raza* towards the Chicano Idiom.'' In Hoffer and Ornstein.

TRAGER, GEORGE L. AND GENEVIEVE VALDEZ
1937 ''English Loans in Colorado Spanish.'' *American Speech* 12 (Feb.):34–44.

TROIKE, RUDOLPH C.
1968 ''Social Dialects and Language Learning Implications of TESOL.'' *TESOL Quarterly* 2 (Sept.):176–80.

TSUZAKI, STANLEY M.
1970 *English Influences on Mexican Spanish in Detroit*. The Hague: Mouton.

TURNER, PAUL R.
1973 *Bilingualism in the Southwest*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

VALDÉS-FALLIS, GUADELUPE
1975 ''Code-Switching in Bilingual Chicano Poetry.'' In Harvey and Heiser.

WEINREICH, URIEL
1968 *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York (6th printing).