TRABAJO DE FIN DE MÁSTER EN LINGÜÍSTICA INGLESA APLICADA

FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA

UNED

CONVOCATORIA DE FEBRERO 2021-2022

ENGLISH-SPANISH LANGUAGE CONTACT IN THE HISPANIC BILINGUAL SPEECH COMMUNITY IN MIAMI: A CASE STUDY

MÓNIKA KISPÉTER

TUTORA: MARÍA ÁNGELES ESCOBAR ÁLVAREZ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

In the highly globalized 21st century it is very frequent to find speech communities where more than one language is used during everyday communication. Many people have left their original community to find better opportunities, a new job or to start a new life in another community or country. They usually like to keep in touch with their own culture, but they also feel the need to communicate with the receiving community. This situation can result in a language contact situation. This TFM examines the language contact situation between the English and Spanish languages in the United States with an attempt to provide a qualitative analysis of the language use of a bilingual speech community living in Miami, Florida. We would like to know that, when they use both languages during the same conversation, whether they borrow words or phrases or, instead of borrowing, they code-switch. We will try to determine the intensity of the language contact situation, and for this, we will mainly focus on the lexical category of the borrowed words. We will also investigate what kind of code-switching they tend to use: tag-switching, intra-sentential or inter-sentential code-switching. Then, we will also try to determine the socio-pragmatic function of these code-switches. Finally, we will try to answer the question whether the members of this community use Spanglish.

The contact situation between the Hispanic or Latino population and the English-speaking citizens in the United States of America is an issue of great academic interest because the Hispanic or Latino population is the largest ethnic and linguistic minority living in the United States, and this number is growing constantly. According to the United States Census Bureau "[t]he Hispanic or Latino population grew from 50.5 million (16.3% of the U.S. population) in 2010 to 62.1 million (18.7%) in 2020"[1]. This means that the Hispanic population grew by 23% during the past ten years. Another important fact is that "[s]lightly more than half (51.1%) of the total U.S. population growth between 2010 and 2020 came from growth in the Hispanic or Latino population"[2]. It must be stated that this population is very heterogeneous because they come from different countries. The U.S. Office of Management and Budget defines "«Hispanic or Latino» as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of

[1]Retrieved November 1, 2021, from https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/08/improved-race-ethnicity-measures-reveal-united-states-population-much-more-multiracial.html
[2] Ibid.

race"[3]. It is needless to mention that there are immigrants of first, second or third generation among those who live there.

The interest in the contact situation of the Spanish and English-speaking population is not new. It is enough to mention Barkin, Brandt and Ornstein-Galicia's *Bilingualism and Language Contact: Spanish, English and Native American languages* book from 1982, which contains 21 articles written by anthropologists, communication experts and linguists. This book is only one example that demonstrates that there are several branches of science that investigate the Hispanic or Latino population of the United States from many different points of view. Sociolinguists examine the language contact phenomenon that emerges as the result of the contact between this population and the majority group — the English-speaking US citizens — from the point of view of the minority group's language use, as their members are mainly bilinguals in Spanish and in English; however, research could also be conducted on whether the minority group influence the language use of the majority group. The members of the Hispanic or Latino population of the United States tend to speak both in Spanish and English during their everyday interactions, since the knowledge of Spanish is the common feature of the members of this minority group, and English is the language that is used to communicate with the rest of the residents of the country, as it is the most used language in the United States. The long-term parallel use of the Spanish and the English languages at the same time by the members of this minority is likely to cause changes in one or even in both languages. These changes can become the "norm" of the variety used by the members since they are understood and accepted by the members. In a lot of cases, the members even consider these changes or the frequent juxtaposition of the two languages as the sign of their bicultural identity, as they may feel that they are part of both cultures. This unique language use is often labelled as Spanglish, a term which is coined from Spanish and English, and its social evaluation is rather heterogeneous.

In this TFM we will deal with a case study of the English-Spanish language contact situation within a bilingual speech community. First, for a better understanding of the actual social and linguistic situation in the United States, we will provide some demographic facts about the Hispanic population in this country. After that, we will define the concepts related to bilingual speech communities and their language use (language contact, borrowing, code-switching, calques, language transfer), and we will also clarify the possible reasons why

[3]Retrieved November 1, 2021, from https://www.census.gov/topics/population/hispanic-origin/about.html

languages borrow and why bilinguals code-switch. Then, as the final part of this section, we will discuss the linguistic phenomenon Spanglish, which is the result of the "mixture" of English and Spanish in the United States.

In the third section, the methodology will be fully addressed. We will compare the different research methods that can be employed by scholars, and we will explain why this study applies the qualitative research method. Then, we will describe the corpus that provides the data for the present research. We will also include the way how the data was collected and then analyzed, together with relevant sociolinguistic information about the participants.

The last section of the study presents the findings and their analysis. First, we will focus on the lexicon found in the discourse, in a way that when the two languages are mixed whether the words originating from one language are adapted into the other language phonologically and morphologically or whether no alteration occurs. If they are adapted, they will be labelled as lexical borrowings, and if they are uttered according to the phonology of the original language, they will be classified as code-switches. These two groups are further categorized. Lexical borrowings are divided into two subgroups: language borrowings and speech borrowings. Language borrowings are those loanwords that are listed in the Dictionary of the Spanish Royal Academy (*Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, DRAE) if they originate from the English language; as well as those that are listed in the American Heritage Dictionary if they originate from the Spanish language. Meanwhile, the latter group includes borrowings that are only accepted by this community and not by monolingual Spanish or English speakers respectively. The lexical borrowings will also be examined based on their lexical category. To find out the intensity of this contact situation we consider four categories: casual contact, slightly more intense contact, more intense contact, and intense contact, following Thomason (2001). Moreover, we will also study the code-switches found in the data, and we will divide them based on the classification of Poplack (1980): tag-switches, when the switch from one language to another only involves a tag phrase; intra-sentential code-switches, when the speaker changes the language in the middle of the sentence; and inter-sentential code-switches, which refers to a switch at a sentence or clause boundary. Finally, we will try to identify the possible socio-pragmatic functions of the code-switches found in the data. These functions can be, according to Montes-Alcalá (2005), (1) quotation, (2) emphasis, (3) clarification or elaboration, (4)

parenthetical comment, (5) idiomatic expression or linguistic routine, (6) triggered switch, (7) stylistic switch (8) lexical need, (9) free switch, and (10) secret code switch. We will attempt to determine the main reason(s) why these bilingual speakers code-switch by examining which socio-pragmatic functions are mostly responsible for a switch to occur.

The findings will provide an insight into the everyday language use of the English-Spanish bilingual speakers who belong to the same speech community, since all the conversations that are analyzed in this study were recorded in Miami, Florida. Therefore, we can only draw conclusions on the language use of this community. This means that no generalizations should be made about all the English-Spanish bilingual speakers of the whole country.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2. 1. Historical background of language contact in the United States

Language contact in the United States has mainly comprised languages after occupations throughout the centuries. When linguists became interested in the English-Spanish language contact situation in the United States, they first paid attention to Mexican American Spanish in the south-western part of the United States. However, the people speaking this variety are not the only existing Hispanic community in the country because other groups of Hispanic descent are situated all over the country, such as Puerto Ricans concentrated in New York, Cubans in Florida, etc. The consequence of this heterogeneity of the Hispanic or Latino population is not only that the Spanish spoken by these peoples is diverse – as different varieties are spoken in the original countries of the immigrants. They also have different social, economic, and educational statuses. All these factors may influence their language use.

The presence of both the English and the Spanish language communities in the actual territory of the United States dates back to the discovery of the New World. According to Roca and Lipski (1993), the Spanish language was first employed in the territory of the United States in the 1530s even before the arrival of the English-speaking settlers. From that time on, it has been continuously used in the south-western region, therefore in this territory

bilingualism is *de facto* bilingualism. However, the first significant wave of Latino immigration took place in the early 20th century, after the Mexican Revolution (1910-1917). Most people, who were employed in mines, agriculture, and the railway industry, did not stay permanently in the United States because they were deported back to Mexico during the Great Depression. The whole population of Puerto Rico became US citizens after World War I, and many of them left the island for the US mainly for economic reasons. They mostly live in New York, but they are also found in the Northeast. Cubans first arrived in the late 1800s, concentrating in Key West, Tampa, and New York. After the takeover of Fidel Castro in 1959, a new influx of Cuban immigrants arrived in the United States. Immigration to the United States still takes place not just from these three countries, but from all the Spanish-speaking countries of the continent. Latino immigrants are considered to be the largest ethnic minority in the United States.

Roca and Lipski (1993) mention several factors why Latin American people consider the United States an attractive destination for immigration. Mexicans suffer from overpopulation and poverty, while in Central America the economy is unstable as a result of the diverse civil wars in those countries. Meanwhile, there are legal and illegal working possibilities in agriculture and in other fields in the United States that attract Hispanic people with the desire for a better future. The chance of those people who immigrate nowadays from these territories is eased by the fact that there are already existing Hispanic communities with which they can identify themselves. As a result of this, they are not necessarily forced to abandon their mother tongue and switch to English during all their interactions, as they also have the possibility to maintain their own language together with their culture and this way, they do not feel alienated from the other members of the receiving society. If they find a community where they can feel they belong, they are more likely to stay. In the meantime, a sense of belonging to both their original culture and to the culture of the new country may evolve.

2.2. Recent demography of the Hispanic or Latino population in the United States

Both “Hispanic” and “Latino” are terms applied when referring to the Spanish-speaking minority of the United States. The reason for the application of these terms is that, according to Fodde Melis (2002, p. 93), Hispanics and Latino are differentiated in a way that

Hispanic refers to those people stereotypically who are more assimilated, conservative and young. As opposed to this, those who claim themselves Latinos tend to be older, more liberal, and occasionally radical. Whereas, the United States Census Bureau clarifies that "[p]eople who identify with the terms »Hispanic« or »Latino« are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories […] "Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano" or "Puerto Rican" or "Cuban" […] "another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin."[4]

In this TFM, we will apply the term Hispanic referring to all the Spanish-speaking residents of the United States, although this term comprises a wide notion because they originate from different countries, not to mention the economic, cultural and generational differences between all the people that speak Spanish in the United States. It also needs to be stated that not necessarily all the people who consider themselves of Hispanic origin can speak Spanish; however, most of them do speak their heritage language.

As it has been pointed out before, the percentage of the Hispanic or Latino population has grown considerably in the last ten years, and it is the largest ethnic minority in the United States. The following table shows the division of the country's population by race

Race	**Per cent of the total population**
White alone	76.3%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	60.1%
Hispanic or Latino	**18.5%**
Black or African American alone	13.4%
Asian alone	5.9%
Two or more races	2.8%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	1.3%
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander alone	0.2%

Table 1. The population of the United States by race[5]

[4]Retrieved November 1, 2021, from https://www.census.gov/topics/population/hispanic-origin/about.html
[5]Retrieved November 1, 2021, from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/POP010220#POP010220

The Hispanic or Latino group is composed of people of different origins, and what is common in them is that they speak Spanish – mainly, but not necessarily, – as their first language. The following table demonstrates how divergent the Hispanic population is according to their country of origin and whether they are first, second or third-generation immigrants:

	Total Hispanic	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central American	South American	Other Hispanic
Total number (in thousands)	60,095	37,447 (62.3%)	5,156 (8.6%)	2,484 (4.1%)	5,585 (9.3%)	3,972 (6.6%)	5,450 (9.1%)
First-generation	20,890	11,750 (56.2%)	33 (0.2%)	1,438 (6.9%)	3,310 (15.8%)	2,472 (11.8%)	1,887 (9.0%)
Second generation	19,168	13,694 (71.4%)	373 (1.9%)	640 (3.3%)	1,817 (9.5%)	1,116 (5.8%)	1,527 (8.0%)
Third generation or higher	20,038	12,003 (59.9%)	4,750 (23.7%)	406 (2.0%)	458 (2.3%)	384 (1.9%)	2,036 (10.2%)

Table 2. Hispanic Origin Type Distribution of the Hispanic Population by Generation: 2019[6]

The diversity of the Hispanic population of the United States implies that their language use might be different as well. Although this does not only depend on their origin, but also their sociological, economic, and educational status, not to mention if they are first, second or third-generation immigrants. This raises the issue that these different speech communities that simultaneously use English and Spanish in their everyday interaction may have different language use, in a way that they mix these two languages differently. Therefore, these speech communities are worth investigating separately, and no general

[6]Retrieved November 11, 2021, from https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2019/demo/hispanic-origin/2019-cps.html – Table 26 (numbers in thousands)

conclusions can be drawn about the language use of all the Hispanic people in the United States based on the observation of one specific speech community.

The Hispanic population is also diverse when it comes to their English language proficiency. There is a tendency that the members of this minority group acquire or learn English — which is the majority language of the United States, as the majority language of a country is usually the language spoken by the group of people that is in political, economic, and cultural power —, especially if they arrive in the country with the intention to settle down, not to mention that the second and third-generation immigrants are very likely to have received their education in English, as they were born and raised in the United States, so they should speak this language too. Table 2 shows that among the Hispanic population of the United States nearly the same amount of the first generation (20,890 thousand), second-generation (19,168 thousand) and third or higher generation (20,038 thousand) immigrants can be found. Stavans (2000) points out that in the United States it is a tendency that third-generation immigrants lose the mother tongue of their grandparents, but this does not seem to occur when it comes to Hispanics. Instead of shifting to be English monolinguals, they tend to be bilinguals, which can be explained by the fact that they belong to a numerous and growing minority group.

A survey carried out in 2019 by the US Census can provide an insight into the English proficiency of the people of Hispanic origin, if we suppose that those people who claim to use Spanish at home are of Hispanic origin. The following table shows the level of English proficiency of those people living in the United States dividing them whether they speak English or a different language at home:

	Total	Speak English "very well"	Speak English less than “very well”
Population 5 years and over	308,834,688 (100%)	—[7]	—
Speak only English	241,032,343 (78%)	—	—
Speak a language other than English	67,802,345 (22%)	42,338,178 (62.4%)	25,464,167 (37.6%)
Speak Spanish	**41,757,391 (13.5%)**	**25,626,084 (61.4%)**	**16,131,307 (38.6%)**

Table 3. Ability to speak English by language spoken at home (2019)[8]

Table 3 demonstrates that, after English, Spanish is the second most widely used language at home, as 61.6% (41,757,391 out of 67,802,345) of those who speak a different language from English at home use Spanish. More than half of the people who speak Spanish at home also claim to speak in English with a high level of proficiency (61.4%). It can be concluded from these figures that most of the Spanish-speaking population of the United States are bilingual, as they can speak in English, too; even if they are not necessarily very fluent and competent speakers. Unfortunately, the data do not contain any information concerning the number of people who do not speak English at all, as they are only differentiated whether they speak English “very well” or less than “very well”, which are quite vague definitions.

The recordings that we analyse in the present study are conversations that took place between the members of the Hispanic community of Miami, Florida. In Miami the 71.51% of the population is Hispanic/Latino[9], which means that in this region they are no longer the minority group but the majority; therefore, this way the members of this community are very likely to maintain their heritage language. In fact, several radio stations or newspapers are

[7]Not appplicable
[8]Retrieved November 11, 2021, from https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=Language%20Spoken%20at%20Home&tid=ACSST1Y2019.S1601&hidePreview=true
[9]Retrieved December 7, 2021, from https://www.miamidadematters.org/demographicdata?id=414&sectionId=935

available in Spanish (e.g.: Miami's major daily newspaper, the morning *The Miami Herald* is supplemented by two Spanish-language dailies, *El Nuevo Patria* and *Diario Las Americas*, and a Spanish-language weekly, *El Nuevo Herald*).

2.3. Speech communities

As in this TFM we examine the language use of the speakers of the Hispanic bilingual speech community in Miami, the definition of the term speech community should be discussed. A community can be identified in terms of space, place, affiliation or practices that are shared by a group of people. The members have something in common which makes them unique and different from the "outsiders". In the case of speech communities, it is their language use that differentiates them from the rest of the people, being unique but accepted among the members. Labov (1989, p. 2) provides the following definition of a speech community: it is "an aggregate of speakers who share a set of norms for the interpretation of language, as reflected in their treatment of linguistics variables: patterns of social stratification, style-shifting, and subjective evaluations". The peculiar way how their language use becomes unique can be the result of various factors, such as sharing nationality, ethnicity, social status, age, gender, profession, etc. Speech communities usually evolve among people who interact frequently and share certain values, ideas or interests. For example, the speakers of African-American Vernacular English can be seen as members of the same speech community, as they share unique grammatical, vocabulary and accent features. The members of a speech community apply these characteristic language use patterns — consciously or unconsciously — to indicate their belonging to that community, and at the same time to show their otherness and uniqueness.

Following the definition provided above, we could think that a speech community uses only one language and applies it in a unique way. However, the members of a speech community can also be bilinguals or multilinguals. The speech community that we investigate is a bilingual speech community, where both English and Spanish are spoken, and the tendency to use both of these languages during the same conversation can be considered as the sign of their "dual-identity" since they consider themselves part of the society of the United States — where English is the majority language —, but they are also

proud of their Hispanic origin, indicating it by maintaining the use of Spanish, their heritage language, too.

2.4. Language contact

It is a widely known fact among linguists that if there are two linguistic communities living close to each other or living in the same place, sooner or later they are very likely to have communication. When the connection between these two communities is established, the two languages involved get into contact. According to Thomason (2001, p. 1), language contact is "the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time". This definition describes situations when at least some people speak more than one language during their everyday interaction. This means communication between some members of the two speech communities, and the result of this communication is that a connection is established between the two languages. Therefore, as Thomason (2001) describes it, the starting point of a language contact situation is always the bilingualism of some members of one or both of the relevant linguistic groups. This does not automatically suggest that these people are fluent bilinguals; it is enough if these people have a certain level of language proficiency that enables them to be understood, and they can fulfil their communicative intentions. If the language contact is prolonged and extended, the languages tend to adapt linguistic features from each other. The minority language is more likely to borrow from the majority language, as the speakers of the minority language tend to speak the majority language as well, to become accepted members of that society. However, it does not necessarily imply that the linguistic influence is unidirectional since the majority group can also adapt features of the minority group's language.

There are several reasons why two different languages come into contact, and this type of contact can also be of different duration or intensity. Thomason (2001) mentions as one possible reason for language contact that the two language communities are neighbours, and they want to share their resources with each other, establish trade or provide mutual benefits to each other. Neighbouring peoples do not always have a peaceful relationship; therefore, one group can conquer and maintain its influence on the other group with the help of the knowledge of the other group's language. Nevertheless, the conquerors may also force the conquered group to learn and use the conquerors' language. Another reason for language

contact suggested by Thomason (2001) is immigration. In this case, small groups of people or even individuals move to another country or region, where another language is spoken. These people usually join the pre-existing population, so they must learn the language spoken there to become members of that society. Not all immigrants arrive in the new country with the intention of staying there permanently, some change residence because of socio-economic reasons but not with the purpose of settling down. These people are sometimes labelled as "guest workers", they normally arrive in a new country or region to work there temporarily, and they are planning to return home after a certain period. At the same time, during their stay in the new country, they are likely to interact with the local citizens, therefore, they can get into contact with the language spoken there.

The English-Spanish language contact in the United States is mainly the result of the immigration of Hispanic people, while it is important to state that Spanish was spoken in parts of the US even before the influx of Hispanic immigration started since this language has been present there from the 1530s onwards.

The stability of a language contact situation depends on social and sometimes historical factors, for instance, the quality of the relationship between the two speech communities, which influences the attitudes of the members of each linguistic community towards the other community and, hence, towards the other language associated with that community. If the minority language is downgraded by the speakers of the majority language, the members of the minority group can maintain their language as a sign of their resistance towards the majority group, or they may no longer feel the need for maintaining their mother tongue. If they opt for the latter, language shift occurs. To put it differently, they cease to use their mother tongue in favour of the other language that is the mother tongue of the other community. Language shift is a process that occurs through generations — if it occurs at all —, and it is preceded by the bilingualism of the members of the minority group, whose descendants choose to use only the majority group's language. For example, in the case of immigrants, there is a tendency that the second and third generations tend to cease using the community language in order to assimilate more into the majority community. It is needless to say that the attitude of the majority community towards the minority community can accelerate or decelerate this process.

In contrast to social and historical factors, linguistic factors are irrelevant whether the contact between the two languages will be maintained. When it comes to the linguistic

features of language contact, (Thomason, 2001) affirms that the phenomenon can happen at every linguistic level between any two languages, they can be of different language families or of different typology. The more intensive the contact is, the more chance there is that the languages in contact will borrow from each other. Borrowing usually occurs first at the lexical level, but it does not imply that other structural borrowings — phonological, morphological, syntactical adaptations — are not possible to happen. Several studies show that anything can be borrowed, even the most complex linguistic structures. Lexical borrowings very often reflect the social background of the language contact because those words tend to be borrowed which seem to emerge in a particular type of contact. Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009) provide some examples claiming that administrative words are likely to be borrowed from the dominant group's language in case of conquest, languages spoken in inland may borrow marine words from the language of a seafaring population, and the invading people borrow the words denominating local flora and fauna which they had not been familiar with.

2.5. The necessity of studying language contact situations

Language contact is studied not only in those countries that have a long history of bilingualism or even multilingualism; that is, countries where historically more than one linguistic group resides, and these groups have contact with each other. Mackey (1967, p. 12) points out that "there are fewer bilingual people in the bilingual countries than there are in the so-called unilingual countries". Hence, this phenomenon is worth investigating also in countries where bilingualism is not *de jure* bilingualism, so in countries where bilingualism is not legally recognized, yet exists. Many of these contact situations have emerged in the last centuries as a result of migration. Appel and Muysken (2005, p. 6) describe this type of language contact situation as "the result of a reverse migratory movement: the influx of people from the post-colonial Third Word societies into the industrial world". Great waves of immigrants have arrived in North America and Europe from the Caribbean and Central America. These language contact situations are relatively recent ones, however, they are probably intense enough because of the need of the immigrants to communicate with the majority group. This need for communication may cause the mutual influence of the two languages involved. As a result of this influence,

different phenomena can be observed, such as bilingualism, borrowing, and code-switching. These phenomena will be discussed in the subsequent sections.

Although the United States has no official language, in legislation and in any other kinds of official federal scene English is used, hence English is the majority language of the country. However, it does not imply that all the residents of the country are English-speaking, or that they speak English as their first language. On the contrary, there are over three hundred other languages spoken on the territory of the United States. Some states are officially bilingual, which, of course, does not mean that all the speakers are bilingual, but the state institutions are provided in two languages: e. g. Hawaii (Hawaiian and English), Maine (French and English), New Mexico (Spanish and English), and Puerto Rico (Spanish and English), although the last one is not a state of the United States, but it is an unincorporated territory. These facts also support the view that language contact is possible to be investigated not only in the *de jure* bilingual countries but also in countries where more than one linguistic community is situated, regardless of the legal status of the languages spoken in these territories.

Fishman (2004, p. 116) describes the actual linguistic situation in the United States as "societal multilingualism", that is the coexistence of diverse ethnic and linguistic groups in the country. However, he also emphasizes that no "fully legitimated multilingual/multiethnic society has developed" (Fishman, 2004, p. 117) during the history of the United States. The evidence for this is that only a few languages have been recognized as an official language of some states besides English until nowadays; nevertheless, as it has been mentioned before, there are many other languages spoken in the territory of the country. The United States of America is often labelled as a "melting pot" since the population of this country comprises several different ethnic and linguistic minorities. People had lived in the actual territory of the country centuries before the arrival of the first European settlers, e.g., Native American Indians, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian. Numerous minority groups, such as German, French, Irish, Southern and Eastern Europeans, etc. arrived at the same time or later as the English-speaking majority of the country (Fishman, 2004).

Many linguists have investigated the English-Spanish language contact in the United States (Amastae & Elías-Olivares, 1982; Elías-Olivares et al. 1985; Wherritt & García, 1988; Roca & Lipski, 2003, etc.) because the Spanish-speaking Hispanic minority is the most numerous minority group in the US (see Table 1), and a significant percentage of these

people also speak English with a high level of proficiency (see Table 3). As a result of the relatively high percentage of English proficiency among the Hispanic people in the United States, these languages have inevitably come into contact. Moreover, there are several different speech communities that may have different language use on the one hand, because of their origin (as the Hispanic population is diverse, as seen in Table 2), and on the other hand, because they have distinct socioeconomic, educational and experience levels, and there are Hispanic communities sporadically in almost all parts of the country. Consequently, every bilingual speech community may have different language use, even though there are several speech communities whose two languages are the same.

We have chosen to observe the language use of a specific speech community. More precisely, we observe the language use in the bilingual speech community in Miami, Florida. The observations and the conclusions drawn are valid only to that specific speech community and not to all the Spanish-English bilingual speech communities that are present in the United States.

3. LANGUAGE CONTACT PHENOMENA

3.1. Borrowing

As discussed in the previous section, when two languages are in contact, they tend to borrow features from each other. It is most feasible that adaptations from one language to another happen at the lexical level; nonetheless, this does not predict that at other linguistic levels no adaptation can take place during the language contact. The process when foreign items are adapted at any level of linguistic structure to the pattern of the recipient language is called borrowing (Poplack & Sankoff, 1984); therefore, for instance, lexical borrowings are morphologically integrated, whereas it does not occur in the case of single-word code-switching.

Since borrowed words are adapted to the linguistic structure of the recipient language, we will now discuss how this adaptation occurs. Campbell (1998, pp. 60-61) argues that, at least in the early stage of language contact, “the foreign sounds are changed to conform to native sounds and phonetic constraints”. She labels this phenomenon as

adaptation or phoneme substitution and explains that, if there is a sound in the word that is non-existent in the recipient language, then it is replaced by the nearest phonetic equivalent. For instance, in Sayula Popoluca *mu:na* 'mule' is borrowed from Spanish, but in Spanish, the word *mula* contains an *l*, which is a non-existent sound in the recipient language, therefore it is replaced by *n*, as it is the closest equivalent. Moreover, not only sounds but also their combination or phonological patterns are adjusted to the constraints of the recipient language through the processes of deletion, addition or recombination of the sounds. Campbell (1998) provides the example of the deletion of the sound /k/ in the word *cruz* /krus/ 'cross' when it is borrowed by Chol, as this language — like other Mayan languages — does not accept initial consonant clusters, this way the word is borrowed as *rus*. Meanwhile, in another Mayan language, Tzolil, when the same word is borrowed, instead of deletion, addition is applied; in other words, the initial consonant cluster is dissolved by the insertion of the vowel *u* between the two consonants: *kurus*. However, Campbell (1998) also points out that borrowing not only happens at the lexical level but if the language contact is intense and long-lasting, new phonemes can also be introduced. This means that the word is borrowed without phonetical adaptation, but the foreign sound is maintained and integrated into the phonological system of the recipient language. For example, the phoneme /v/ did not exist in the English language before its intense contact with French, since it was only the allophonic realisation of the phoneme /f/ when it appeared in intervocalic position, but partially due to the borrowing of words with initial /v/ — such as in the word *vrai* 'true' used as *very* —, this allophone has become a phoneme in the English language. Lexical borrowings are also often modified in order to match the morphological patterns of the recipient language.

Grosjean (1982) differentiates between two types of borrowings: speech borrowing and language borrowing. The first one is a kind of borrowing that takes place at the individual level, so it is only applied by the individual who utters it. Meanwhile, language borrowing is at the community or national level, so it is accepted and understood by the monolinguals in the recipient language as well. We will apply the term language borrowing in this TFM to those words and phrases in the Spanish language that are originating from the English language and are accepted by the Spanish Royal Academy (*Real Academia Española*). If the Academy accepts them, then they are registered in the official dictionary of the Spanish language (*Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, hereafter DRAE). The Spanish Royal Academy is the institution that is responsible for approving the new words

that enter the language and for deciding which structure is part of the standard language. This academy does not only take into account Castilian Spanish (the variety of Spanish spoken in Spain), but also the Spanish spoken elsewhere around the world. Therefore, the dictionary includes words that are typically used only in Latin American countries or even in Spanish spoken in the United States. Words and phrases in the English language that are of Spanish origin will be labelled as language borrowings if they are listed in the American Heritage Dictionary. The other borrowings, which are not registered in the dictionary, will be considered as loanwords (the product of borrowing) at the individual level, hence we will label them as speech borrowings.

3.2. Calques versus loanwords

Calque, also called loan translation or semantic loan, is differentiated from lexical borrowing in a sense that a word or a phrase is a calque when the meaning is transferred into an already existing lexical item (Silva-Corvalán, 1995); whereas in the case of a loanword, the form is transferred together with the meaning from one language into another. Hence, a calque can be considered as a special type of borrowing, a semantic borrowing, a "morpheme-by-morpheme translation" (Thomason, 2001, p. 260). Obviously, a calque cannot be classified as a code-switch because it is uttered in the same language, even if the original meaning is derived from another language. Silva-Corvalán (1995, pp. 254-255) provides examples for single-word and multiple-word calques from English to Spanish: *grados* 'grades' with the extended meaning of marks received by students at school, while Spanish monolingual people would typically use *nota* 'grade' to refer to it, and *máquina de contestar* 'answering machine', while the originally used Spanish word is *contestador* to label this type of machine. Even idioms, collocations and proverbs can be transferred from one language to another: *Estoy quebrada* 'I'm broke' substitutes the Spanish bound collocation *I have no peso* 'I don't have a peso' (Silva-Corvalán, 1995, p. 256).

3.3. Language transfer versus borrowing

Lado (1957, as cited in Gass & Selinker, 1992, p. 1) affirms that "[i]ndividuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings of their native language, and the distribution of forms

and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture". To put it differently, it refers to the influence of the speaker's first language on the language that they are acquiring. The transfer can be positive if it coincides with the form in the second language or it can be negative if this is not the case. Although language transfer is a term used in the field of second and foreign language acquisition, many members of the bilingual Hispanic population can also be considered as speakers of English as a second language — especially that 38.6% (see in Table 3) claim to speak English less than "very well" —, which can result in applying this strategy when speaking. Nevertheless, it does not necessarily mean that no language transfer can be found in highly competent language users' speech.

Borrowing and language transfer are very similar and sometimes they cannot even be differentiated. Language transfer implies an individual strategy that a speaker applies when using an element from their first language while speaking in their second language, normally with the rather unconscious intention to compensate for their lack of knowledge of that element in the second language. It is similar to speech borrowing, where the borrowing occurs at an individual level. We can even argue that borrowing can be the result of continuous language transfer, especially in the case of calques, where the meaning from one language is transferred into an already existing form in the other language.

3.4. Why do languages borrow?

It is virtually impossible to find a language that has no loanwords, that is, a language in the lexicon of which there are no words adapted from another language or languages. But what is the reason why languages borrow from each other? Campbell (1998) provides several reasons: the first and perhaps more obvious reason is that the recipient language has no word or expression for a particular object or notion, which is why the word or phrase expressing it is adapted from the source language to fulfil this need, instead of creating a new word or expression for it in the recipient language. For instance, many languages have similar words referring to automobile: Russian *avtomobil'*, Finnish *auto*, Swedish *bil* derived from the last syllable of *automobile*. (Campbell, 1998, p. 59) The second reason is that, although there is a word expressing an object or a notion in the recipient language, the speakers start to use the word from the source language to give a different and new aspect to the meaning, in other words, to specify it. If the speakers of the recipient language consider the source

language as a more prestigious language than their own, they may borrow words from the source language occasionally in order to seem more educated or of higher social status. For example, French was of higher status than English during the Norman French dominance in England, therefore the French word *cuisine* 'kitchen' was borrowed into English referring to cuisine (Campbell, p. 59). Obviously, it can happen the other way around; that is, words or expressions can be borrowed from the less prestigious language to express negative prestige, that is, to give a negative connotation to the word or expression. For example, Finnish borrowed the neutral term *kon^{j}* 'horse' and they apply it with a negative connotation, *koni* 'old horse, nag' (Campbell, 1998. p. 60).

According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988, p. 14), "as far as the strictly linguistic possibilities go any linguistic feature can be transferred from any language to any other language". However, many studies have demonstrated that not all the linguistic features are borrowed with the same likelihood, therefore several scholars have provided borrowability scales. Haugen (1950, as cited in Melissaropoulou & Ralli, 2019, p. 710) established the following order:

(1) nouns > verbs > adjectives > adverbs, prepositions, interjections

Meanwhile, Muysken (1981, as cited in Melissaropoulou & Ralli, 2019, p. 710) provides a slightly different scale:

(2) nouns > adjectives > verbs > prepositions > coordinating conjunctions > quantifiers > determiners > free pronouns > clitic pronouns > subordinating conjunctions

Whereas the borrowing scale proposed by Matras (2007) is also somewhat distinct from the previous scales:

(3) nouns, conjunctions > verbs > discourse markers > adjectives > interjections > adverbs > other particles, adpositions > numerals > pronouns > derivational affixes > inflectional affixes. (Matras, 2007, as cited in Melissaropoulou & Ralli, 2019, p. 710).

According to all three scales, nouns are the most likely to be borrowed. Matras explains that "the high borrowability of nouns is a product of their referential functions since

nouns cover the most differentiated domains for labelling concepts, objects, and roles" (Matras, 2009, as cited in Manfredi et al, p. 288). Myers-Scotton (2002, p. 239) labels these lexical elements as "non-core borrowings". It is natural that we would like to know how to refer to previously not known objects or concepts, so these lexical borrowings can fill this gap in our mental lexicon.

Thomason (2001) differentiates four contact situations based on their intensity: casual contact, slightly more intense contact, more intense contact and intense contact. She discusses the lexical elements that are supposed to be borrowed in each type of language contact. In casual contact situations the borrowed lexical elements are "only content words — most often nouns, but also verbs, adjectives and nouns" (Thomason, 2001, p. 70). This is mainly in concordance with the three borrowability scales discussed above, although Matras (2007) proposes that conjunctions are as likely to be borrowed as nouns. The contact situation is slightly more intense when not only content words but function words (e. g., conjunctions and adverbial particles) are borrowed as well. In the case of a more intense contact situation, beyond the above-mentioned categories, basic vocabulary and closed-class items, such as pronouns, are also borrowed. The contact situation is intense when items from all sections are heavily borrowed. In this study, we will follow Thomason's borrowability scale while examining the lexical category of the borrowings found in the discourse in order to attempt to determine the intensity of the English-Spanish language contact situation in the Hispanic bilingual community in Miami.

3.5. Code-switching

After discussing the notion of borrowing, we will now define the term code-switching and discuss how it can be differentiated from borrowing. This phenomenon has been investigated for decades from various points of view, and it has been defined in several ways. Code-switching is "the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation or interaction" (Myers-Scotton & Ury, 1977, as cited in Grosjean, 1982, p. 145). This definition implies that code-switching can occur while speaking in one language but applying two of their varieties during the same conversation. According to Crystal (2008, p. 83), the notion of code "is mainly used as a neutral label for any system of communication involving language — and which avoids sociolinguists having to commit themselves to such

terms as dialect, language or variety". This definition implies that the term code itself cannot specify whether code-switching occurs between two languages, two dialects or two varieties. Gumperz (1982) provides a similar definition to that of Myers-Scotton and Ury (1977): "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to the different grammatical systems or subsystems" (Gumperz, 1982, p. 59), although here a grammatical system can be understood as a language, while subsystem can be viewed as a different variety of the same language. Milroy and Muysken, (1995, as cited in Manfredi et al., 2015, p. 284) go further by stating that code-switching is "the alternative use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation". They imply that code-switching can only occur in bilingual speakers' discourse; whereas, the previous definitions do not discard a switch between varieties of the same language. While we also claim that code-switching can occur as an alternation of varieties of the same language, in this research we will only label as code-switching when a switch from one language to another language happens — let it be from English to Spanish or vice versa —, leaving out any possible switch between varieties of the same language. When the two codes, the two languages, are used separately in separate conversations, even if by bilinguals in the same two languages, it is not considered to be code-switching but code alternation.

Gumperz (1982, p. 59) asserts that "[m]ost frequently the alternation takes the form of two subsequent sentences, as when a speaker uses a second language either to reiterate his message or to reply to someone else's statement", but later he also states that "[o]ften code-switching also takes place within a single sentence […] [t]hey combine to form one message, the interpretation of which depends on understanding both parts" (Gumperz, 1982, p. 60). Poplack (1980) shares a similar view since she differentiates three types of code-switching: tag-switching, inter-sentential code-switching and intra-sentential code-switching. The first type refers to the insertion of a tag phrase or word from one language to another one. Inter-sentential code-switching means that the switch occurs at clause or sentence level, meanwhile, intra-sentential code-switching implies switching within a clause or sentence boundary. In this study, we will apply this classification since we will also investigate whether all these three types of code-switches occur in the casual conversations of the members of the Hispanic bilingual community in Miami and whether they use them with the same frequency.

Another definition of code-switching provided by Manfredi et al. (2015, p. 286) states that "[code-switching] is the presence of lexical or sentential material belonging to different linguistic systems, provided that its different origin is still transparent in the speaker's output in one or more grammatical domains". This definition specifies how code-switching is differentiated from borrowing. During single-word code-switching — which can be confused with lexical borrowing — the word from language A is not integrated into language B, unlike in the case of borrowing. During single-word code-switching, the speaker totally shifts from language A to language B while that particular word is uttered, and after that, they return to use language A. What is more, borrowing normally implies that the word is accepted and understood by the monolingual speakers of a certain language; meanwhile, code-switching is only understood by bilinguals among each other provided they speak the same two languages, as it suggests "some degree of competence in the two languages" (Pfaff, 1979, p. 296). Haugen (1956, as cited in Poplack, 1987, p. 55) also has a similar view on the differentiation of borrowing from code-switching. He defines single-word code-switch as a word "maximally distinct from the surrounding discourse"; while a loanword from the synchronic viewpoint is equivalent to the recipient-language material. The distinction seems to be clear and sharp; as opposed to this, Poplack (1987, p. 55) affirms that "superficially the two [borrowing and code-switching] may be indistinguishable in appearance" because it is not always obvious if a word is really integrated into the recipient language or not. For instance, a word from language A can be pronounced according to the phonological patterns of language B, because the speaker pronounces all the words from language A with language B accent. This does not automatically suggest that the given word is a real loanword in language B from language A. Investigating the supposed loanword from the morphological point of view does not necessarily help to decide the question either because in the case of uninflected single words when no affixation should be applied both in language A and in language B, it is impossible to conclude if these words are integrated or not in the language in which the other words in the sentence are uttered. For instance, singular nouns both in English and Spanish have a zero morpheme, therefore it cannot be decided with the help of the morphology whether those words are uttered in English or in Spanish. Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that borrowing becomes part of the mental lexicon, whereas code-switching does not; therefore, she suggests that loanwords should be differentiated from code-switching on how frequently the lexical item is used. She also affirms that not all lexical borrowings are fully integrated into the recipient language.

Matras (2009) suggests that there is a continuum between code-switching and borrowing (see Table 4), as theoretically there is no boundary between these two notions.

Bilinguality bilingual speaker ↔ monolingual speaker
Composition elaborate utterance / phrase ↔ single lexical item
Functionality special conversational effect, stylistic choice ↔ default expression
Unique referent (specificity) lexical ↔ para-lexical
Operationality core vocabulary ↔ grammatical operations
Regularity single occurrence ↔ regular occurrence
Structural integration not integrated ↔ integrated
Code-switching ↔ borrowing

Table 4. A bidirectional code-switching-borrowing continuum (Matras, 2009, p. 111)

Although it has been demonstrated above that it is not always easy to distinguish code-switching from borrowing, we argue that they can be and should be differentiated when it comes to single lexical items, expressions or phrases.

Code-switching is described as a systematic rule-governed phenomenon (Poplack, 1987, Myers-Scotton & Jake, 1995). The rules are difficult to define; however, numerous studies confirm the assumption that code-switching cannot occur randomly between any elements of the utterance. Poplack (1980), and later Sankoff and Poplack (1981) found only two general syntactic constraints on intra-sentential code-switching: the free-morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint. According to the free-morpheme constraint, "a switch cannot take place between the stem of a word and its affix, unless the stem has been

phonologically integrated into the language of the affix", in other words, there cannot be an intra-word mixing of morphemes; while equivalence constraint argues that "the word order immediately before and after a switch point must be possible in both languages" (Sankoff & Poplack, 1981, as cited in Grosjean, 1982, pp. 324-326). This implies that the surface structure of none of the languages can be violated. Belanzi et al. (1994) argue that code-switching should not occur between a functional head and its complement. However, this functional head constraint has been challenged by Rothman and Rell (2005, p. 524) providing an example that contradicts: "*Creí que María* always told the truth" 'I thought that María always told the truth', where the head of the complementizer phrase is in Spanish, meanwhile the rest is in English. Myers-Scotton (1993) differentiates two constraints applying a matrix language model of analysis: system morpheme principle and morpheme order principle, and she argues that matrix language provides a higher number of morphemes during the discourse, while the matrix language may change across time or even within the same conversation. All these hypotheses confirm that code-switching has universal constraints, and it is not a random mixing of two languages at any point within sentence or word boundaries.

Some scholars use the terms code-switching and code-mixing interchangeably when referring to applying two languages or language varieties during the same conversation; meanwhile, other linguists distinguish these two terms, but the way how they comprehend the difference is not unanimous. Bokamba (1989, p. 3) claims that these two expressions are different, as "code-switching is the mixing of words, phrases, and sentences from two distinct grammatical (sub)systems across sentence boundaries within the same speech event". Whereas he defines code-mixing as "the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (free morphemes), phrases and clauses from a co-operative activity where the participants, to infer what is intended must reconcile what they hear with w0hat they understand" (Bokamba, 1989, p. 3). These two definitions are in line with the terms applied, hence the word switch refers to the alternating and not simultaneous use of the two codes (languages or varieties), using the analogy of a mental toggle switch between the two codes. As opposed to this, the term mixing implies the simultaneous application and presence of both languages, in other words, the hybridization of the two languages. Crystal (2008) also distinguishes these two terms, although his definitions and the examples that he gives can seem a little confusing. He illustrates code-switching with "the switch bilingual or bidialectal people may make (depending on who they are talking to,

or where they are) between standard and regional forms of English, between Welsh and English in parts of Wales, or between occupational and domestic varieties" (Crystal, 2008, p. 83). This explanation implies that the switch between languages is merely depending on the social context where the discourse takes place. What is more, he even affirms that this linguistic behaviour is sometimes also called code-shifting or within the same language, style-shifting. The definition does not specify whether the switch occurs within the same utterance or discourse and if yes, where it can take place: within a clause or sentence boundary (intra-sentential) or between a clause or sentence boundary (inter-sentential). As opposed to this, he describes code-mixing as "the transfer of linguistic elements from one language into another: a sentence begins in one language, then makes use of words or grammatical features belonging to another" (Crystal, 2008, p. 83). Spanglish (the linguistic phenomenon we will discuss later in section 3.7.) is provided as one of the examples of these mixed forms of language, together with Franglais and Singlish. The definition does not clarify whether the rest of the sentence is in the other language or only some elements of it, neither does it specify where in the sentence the switch occurs. A somewhat similar differentiation is provided by Singh (1985), who proposes the term code-mixing for intra-sentential switches, which is how the definition of code-mixing provided by Crystal (2008) can be interpreted since for Crystal (2008) this linguistic phenomenon occurs when the speaker switches from one language to another within a sentence. Singh (1985) would apply the term code-switching for inter-sentential switches. Now, this definition differs from the one proposed by Crystal (2008), since an inter-sentential switch does not automatically mean a switch in style or regional form, as it is suggested by Crystal (2008). Muysken (2000, p. 1) also differentiates code-mixing from code-switching by applying the former term to "all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear together", and he reserves the latter term for "the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event". According to this point of view, code-switching can be understood as a type of code-mixing.

It is clear to see from these definitions discussed above that many divergent viewpoints are proposed on how to differentiate code-switching from code-mixing. In this study, we will apply only the term code-switching when it comes to a switch from English to Spanish or vice versa, regardless of whether it happens within or beyond the boundaries of a clause or a sentence. To differentiate where the switch occurs, we will apply the terms intra-sentential and inter-sentential code-switches.

3.6. Why do bilinguals code-switch?

It is easy to understand why bilingual speakers use one or the other language they speak. A bilingual speaker of languages A and B uses language A to communicate with a monolingual person in language A, while the same bilingual speaker uses language B when they address a monolingual speaker of language B. In these conversations, code-switching is highly improbable to occur, whereas it is likely to take place when a bilingual converses with another bilingual, obviously if they share the same two languages. As it has been discussed before, sometimes just a single lexical item from the other language is inserted in the sentence, in other cases it can involve a clause, a sentence or it can be even longer. We have also seen that the switch can occur within clause or sentence boundaries, whereas sometimes it happens beyond these boundaries when the speaker starts a new sentence. Many researchers have investigated how bilinguals organize the two languages in their memory, but what is exactly known about the reasons why bilinguals switch from one language to another within one conversation? To answer this question, code-switching has been investigated from different points of view. Becker (1997, p. 3) asserts that "[r]esearchers from various fields — linguistics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, and education — agree that both internal and external factors must be examined in order to adequately describe this linguistic behavior". For this reason, Becher (1997) proposes a three-dimensional model where structural linguistic factors, internal psycholinguistic factors, and external social factors are analyzed. These factors are investigated independently, but their interdependence should not be neglected. We have already viewed the structural constraints when it comes to intra-sentential code-switching. To concentrate on the other two factors, psycholinguists conduct research on the speaker's linguistic capacity that makes the switch possible, whereas sociolinguists try to determine the social motive that triggers the switch, and from the pragmatic point of view, the possible meaning which can be conveyed by code-switching is observed.

Heredia and Altarriba (2001) discuss code-switching from the psycholinguistic point of view, and they argue that code-switching should not occur "[g]iven the speed with which spoken language occurs, and the cognitive resources required during the comprehension and integration of different linguistic factors (e.g., phonological, grammatical and semantic information)" (Heredia & Altarriba, 2001, p. 164), especially if the switch is from the first language to the second language, where retrieving may take more time. As opposed to this,

it does happen. Heredia and Altarriba (2001) mention language proficiency as one of the possible reasons. Bilinguals do not necessarily have a high proficiency in both languages, so code-switching can serve to compensate for the lack of linguistic knowledge. However, this is not always the result of not knowing the correct word, it can easily happen because the speaker does not apply this word frequently. Furthermore, if lack of language proficiency were always the reason, then code-switching would not always be a rule-governed phenomenon, as it could happen at any point during a conversation when the conversation break-down can only be solved by switching to the other tongue. As opposed to this, several investigations have shown that a switch between two languages cannot occur randomly at any point of the utterance, but there are some constraints (see section 3.5.). What is more, Poplack (1980, p. 614) also concluded from her research on Spanish-English intra-sentential mixing that "there are virtually no ungrammatical combinations of L1 and L2 in the 1,835 switches studied, regardless of the bilingual ability of the speaker", hence code-switching does occur regardless of the bilingual speaker's level of proficiency. Gumperz (1982, p. 65) also affirms that "[i]n many cases, the code-switched information could equally well be expressed in either language", so the switch does not happen to compensate for the lack of proficiency. He also describes this linguistic phenomenon as an automatic part of the bilinguals' speech, since hesitation before the switch was observed only in a few cases. Another question that arises concerning the statement that code-switching depends on language proficiency is how to define language proficiency. Which language skills are more important, as speakers may not have the same level of proficiency in all four skills? Some speakers, for instance, may be fluent in speaking, but not that proficient in writing or reading. Heredia and Altarriba (2001) also discuss whether language dominance influences code-switching; in other words, as the lexicon of the first language is greater and bears more information, its access should be easier. This implies that code-switching should occur from the second language to the first language. However, Heredia and Altarriba (2001, p. 167) suggest that "after a certain level of fluency and frequency of use is attained in a second language […] the second language becomes more readily accessible than the first language, and the bilingual comes to rely on it". This way, the second language can become more active, becoming the dominant language, therefore code-switching is more likely to occur with intrusions from the second language while speaking in the first language compared to intrusions from the first language while speaking in the second language at the early stage of bilingualism.

Thomason (2001, p. 132) claims that "code-switching serves many different conversational functions". She mentions some of them: when a word is adopted from the other language to fill in a lexical gap, to provide a more precise meaning; to switch the style as well, occasionally to seem more educated or of higher social status; when the content of the utterance is related to the language to which the speaker switches; or to express the emotional attachment to the language which the speaker switches to. Becker (1997, p. 3) describes that "[b]ilinguals assert that this alternation between their two languages allows them to convey their message more precisely, more naturally, and more personally". Following Manfredi et al. (2015) the phenomenon of bilingual code-switching implies pragmatical knowledge since code-switching is "at least in principle the result of choice" (Manfredi et al., 2015, p. 286). Most social and psychological values should be at least shared by the community of speakers. This also supports the idea that code-switching can also be a sign of belonging to a specific speech community, in this case obviously to a bilingual speech community, which is also bi-cultural, and where the same idea uttered in one language or in the other may convey a different meaning.

When it comes to identifying what functions code-switching can have, Gumperz (1982, p. 80) differentiates six functions: quotation marking, addressee specification, interjection, reiteration, message qualification, and personalization versus objectivization. Quotation marking refers to citing in the same language in which the message was uttered. Addressee specification shows to whom the message is meant to be sent. In the case of interjection, the switch to the other language to express any kind of emotion. Reiteration serves to clarify the message. Message qualification implies showing interest or emotion or that the message can be better understood if uttered in that specific language. Finally, personalization versus objectivization involves showing personal interest or a rather impersonal point of view.

A different classification is provided by Montes-Alcalá (2005), who after having analyzed electronic correspondence among Spanish-English bilinguals, proposes ten socio-pragmatic functions that code-switching can fulfil:

(1) *Citas* (quotation – my translation): the switch takes place when the speaker reproduces someone else's words in the same language as they were uttered. Direct quotation can be differentiated from indirect quotation. An example of direct quotation is: "Y AL FINAL ELLA ESTABA MUERTA Y ESTABA HABLANDO CON DEBBIE, QUE LE DECÍA

»well I guess you must have just missed that part of class!«", whereas indirect quotation would be "DESPUÉS ME QUEDÉ PENSANDO POR LO QUE DIJISTE QUE that would make the other guy mad." (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 176).[10]

(2) *Énfasis* (emphasis – my translation): the switch occurs as a result of a change in intonation. For example: "My midterm in Poli Sci was returned and I got a big A-, when I was expecting something a lot worse!!! QUÉ ALIVIO!!!" (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 177).

(3) *Aclaración o elaboración* (clarification or elaboration – my translation): the switch serves to explain an idea, a word or an expression that has just been uttered in the other language. For example: "PERO SE DEJA LLEVAR POR EL VIENTO, YA VEO QUE ME VA A ESCUCHAR, she's very influenciable." (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 177).

(4) *Comentarios parentéticos* (parenthetical comment – my translation): it is closely related to the previous function, as it serves to elaborate on an idea. For example: "AÚN NO SÉ A QUÉ OFICINA ME MANDARÁN (or even whether I'll still have this computer!!), PERO POR AHORA SIGO AQUÍ." (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 178).

(5) *Expresiones idiomáticas o rutinas lingüísticas* (idiomatic expression or linguistic routine – my translation): some expressions, phrases are difficult to translate, that is why it seems more precise or appropriate in a certain context to use them in the original language, even if it results in code-switching. It does not imply that the expression is inexistent in the other language, but it appears to be more effective to maintain the original language. For example: "Just kidding, NO HE HABLADO CON NADIE. (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 179).

(6) *Cambios provocados* (triggered switch – my translation): a specific word can trigger that the rest of the sentence is produced in the language in which that word has been uttered. For example: "PUES AQUÍ ESTOY MUY **bored**....and the night is still young. (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 180). Anticipatory triggering refers to the fact that the element which triggers the switch can also occur after the switch itself, as in the following example: "LAURA ESCONDIENDO everyone's **drinks**!" (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 181).[11]

[10] The parts that were written in Spanish are reproduced in capital letters.
[11] The words triggering the switch are represented in bold.

(7) *Cambios estilísticos* (Stylistic switch – my translation): in this case, the switch serves as a technique to make an expression more "colourful". It is very similar to emphasis. For example: "TE LO AGRADECERÍA a lot. MUCHOS thankyous. (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 180).

(8) *Necesidad léxica* (Lexical need – my translation): in some cases, the reason of this function is similar to that of idiomatic expressions, namely that the word or expression is more accurate in the original language than its translation; or sometimes the use of a technical term is required instead of its translation. This does not imply that the speaker is not competent enough in the other language to find the correct word or expression, but rather it demonstrates the biculturalism of the speaker, as the word or expression can be more culturally and semantically adequate than its counterpart in the other language, if there is any. For example: "ME CONFIRMÓ JUAN QUE FUE MUY OBVIO, Y NO SOLAMENTE EN LA produce section, TAMBIÉN EN EL check-out line (ELLOS ESTABAN EN EL express lane.)" (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 181).

(9) *Cambios libres* (Free switch – my translation): not all the switches that occur have a function or at least it is possible to identify the function it realizes. Obviously, it does not mean that code-switching is a random phenomenon, but in some of the switches do not seem to fit in any of the categories, meanwhile in several cases the function of the switch can be interpreted in different ways and therefore more than one functions can be identified. For example: "YO ESTOY DE ACUERDO on the group nomination. (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 182).

(10) *Cambio como código secreto* (Secret code switch – my translation): In this case, code-switching serves the function of exclusion. If the speaker does not want a third person to understand the conversation, then they switch to the language which is not spoken by that third person, meanwhile the other bilingual listener can understand the message without any difficulty. Montes-Alcalá (2005) describes this function as the opposite of situational code-switching, in which case the speaker changes to their other tongue so that the listener can understand them. For example: "PUES, AQUÍ ESTABA CONTÁNDOTE COSITAS DE you know who, Y LLEGA JUAN Y TUVE QUE CANCELAR MI MENSAJE..." (Montes-Alcalá, 2005, p. 182).

Although the corpus used by Montes-Alcalá (2005) is written, whereas the corpus of this study is oral, we will use her classification when we try to identify the function of the code-switches found in the discourse. However, it is relatively difficult to identify what causes the switch or why it happens; meanwhile, in other cases, various factors can intervene at the same time.

3.7. Spanglish

Since this research presented in this TFM concentrates on the contact of the English and Spanish language, it is important to address the issue of Spanglish and the various definitions provided for this linguistic phenomenon. It is commonly known that the term is coined from the word English and Spanish, sometimes even referred to it as *Espanglish* or *Espanglés.*

According to the definition provided by the American Heritage Dictionary, Spanglish is "Spanish characterized by numerous borrowings from English"[12]. In the Merriam-Webster Dictionary a similar definition is found: "Spanish marked by numerous borrowings from English, broadly: any of various combinations of Spanish and English"[13]. Although the second definition leaves somehow ambiguous what is meant by "combinations". Is it code-switching, borrowing, a dialect of one of these languages or a third language? Moreover, this definition lacks the description that Spanglish is used by the Hispanic population in the United States, while the DRAE includes this geographic information about the phenomemon:*"[m]odalidad del habla de algunos grupos hispanos de los Estados Unidos en la que se mezclan elementos léxicos y gramaticales del español y del inglés*[14] (speech mode of some Hispanic groups in the United States in which lexical and grammatical elements of Spanish and English are mixed – my translation). However, this definition does not state whether it is a variety of Spanish or that of English but rather defines it as a mixture of these two languages. As opposed to this, the Cambridge Dictionary describes Spanglish as a "language that is a combination of Spanish and English"[15]. This way, Spanglish can be

[12]Retrieved November 20, 2021, from https://www.ahdictionary.com/word/search.html?q=Spanglish
[13]Retrieved November 20, 2021, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Spanglish
[14]Retrieved November 20, 2021, from https://dle.rae.es/espanglish#Rq8JJSS
[15]Retrieved November 20, 2021, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/spanglish

interpreted as an individual language that evolved as the result of the mixture of these two languages.

It is important to note that not only the descriptions provided by different dictionaries are not homogenous, but also linguists approach this term from different points of view. Lipski (2004, p. 1) refers to Spanglish as "the emergence of the innovative Spanish dialects". Maroney (1998, as cited in Montes-Alcalá, 2009, p. 99) defines it as "a hybrid lingo spoken by second- and third-generation Latinos", while Hernández (2004, as cited in Montes-Alcalá, 2009, p. 99) argues that it is "the fluid vernacular that crossed between English and Spanish". The last two definitions can be interpreted as a reference to Spanglish as a language in itself, although it is not absolutely clear if they mean language or dialect/variety when they apply the terms lingo and vernacular. It is likely that it makes reference to a language variety, yet it is not clearly specified whether it is a variety of Spanish or English. Other definitions put the emphasis rather on the fact that Spanglish emerges as the contact of two cultures not only that of the two languages, and consequently, the speakers feel that they belong to both cultures. For instance, Stavans (2000, p. 557) asserts that "Spanglish meets the needs of its speakers in that it allows for the expression of the dual-identity that is the essence of the immigrants' being". He also describes Spanglish as "the verbal encounter between the Anglo and Hispano civilizations" (Stavans, 2003, p. 5). Similarly, Zentella (2016, p. 31) describes that "Spanglish is a graphic way of saying »we speak both because we are both«".

Stavans (2000) argues that although in the United States immigrants have arrived from different parts of the world, it has been a tendency that the third generation of immigrants surrender their ancestors' mother tongue and become monolingual in English; as opposed to this the Latinos seem to follow a different pattern. It can be explained with the fact that the influx is continuous, Spanish is the language of the immigrants, but instead of losing it, they maintain it while they also embrace English, and the two languages are juxtaposed. Stavans (2000, p. 557) claims that Spanglish "is used by the Hispanics to establish a form of empathy among themselves. […] it is not defined by class, for people in all social strata, from migrant workers to upper-class types such as congressmen, TV anchors, and comedians use it regularly". Although later he affirms that "Spanglish is looked down upon by the Hispanic intelligentsia". This statement shows that the social recognition of Spanglish also heterogenous. An extreme viewpoint was adapted by Tío (1954) — a

Puerto Rican journalist, who claims himself to be the inventor of the term Spanglish —, when he started to publish articles from 1952 onwards considering this phenomenon as a deterioration of the Spanish language in Puerto Rico as the consequence of the influence of the English language. This journalist had a satirical point of view and expressed his fear that Puerto Rican Spanish will disappear, and a creole language will evolve. We will discuss later why his prediction does not seem very likely to come true (see section 3.8.). Furthermore, Lipski (2007, p. 204) accuses him of deliberately inventing "pseudo-bilingual monstrosities in order to denigrate legitimate bilingual speech communities individually and collectively". Lipski (2007) also suggests that Spanglish is commonly used by non-Latinos with an element of racism and xenophobia. González Echevarría (1997) states that "Spanglish is primarily the language of poor Hispanics, many barely literate in either language". Later he argues that using Spanglish "indicates marginalization, not enfranchisement". Similarly, Lipski (2004, p. 1) claims that "[i]n most cases the word »Spanglish« and the related connotations of linguistic hybridity *qua* illegitimate birth are used to denigrate the linguistic abilities of Hispanic speakers born or raised in the United States". On the contrary, there is a rebirth of Spanglish, as "Spanglish as an originally derogatory term […] is being co-opted by its former victims as a badge of pride and courage" (Lipski, 2007, p. 209).

Stavans (2000) proposes that Spanglish might be legitimised as an individual language if a great work of literature has been produced in it. In fact, a few years later, in 2003, he wrote a book titled *Spanglish: The Making of a New American Language* in which he made an attempt to "translate" the first chapter of the *Don Quixote de la Mancha* illustrating this way the creativity of a bilingual speaker. The book also contains a collection of Spanglish lexicon. Cashman (2005, p. 216) in her review of Stavans' book proposes the question "[d]oes [Spanglish] refer to the incorporation of English-origin words into a Spanish morpho-syntactic matrix?" Several examples are presented where not the English word or expression itself is incorporated but a semantic transfer occurs (calques, see section 3.2.), in other words, the Spanish translation is applied but associated with a meaning it only has in English and not in Spanish (e.g., *cambié mi mente*, which comes from the English expression "I changed my mind" but it does not exist in the Spanish language). In addition, Cashman (2005) also talks about phrases which violate Spanish grammar rules. She also finds problematic that in the collection of Spanglish lexicon, although makes the attempt to classify English loanwords in Spanish and Spanish loanwords in English, the attribution of region and group of origin is obscure. Moreover, Spanish loanwords are listed which do not

seem to meet the definition of Spanglish, for example, *siesta, hacienda, arroyo* and *buckaroo* (Cashman, 2005, p. 218).

Although Stavans appears to be a leading voice to legitimize Spanglish as an individual language, the reasons why it should not be considered as a language itself are proposed by Lipski (2004). He claims that it is still a variety of Spanish, even if it contains a high number of English borrowings; moreover, none of the conversations that contain code-switching in any two languages is labelled as a different third language; although the monolingual grammar of the speaker is undoubtedly expanded with the grammatical and pragmatic constraints that allow code-switching to occur. A new language might emerge through several generations in a highly unlikely event when the speakers cease to have a connection with monolingual English or Spanish speakers, but being the situation as it is now, both English and Spanish will remain as separate languages.

When it comes to examining the structure of Spanglish, Rothman and Rell (2005, pp. 520-521) suggest three subdivisions:

> *1, the adaptation of the lexical units or phrasal constituents from one language into the other on phonological, morphological and/or morphophonological level;*
>
> *2, the adaptation of some lexical elements or phrasal constituents from one language into another semantically;*
>
> *3. the phenomenon of code-switching or a rule-governed amalgamation of the two languages at the level of syntax.*

The first subdivision refers to borrowing, where loanwords are borrowed from one language but pronounced according to the phonological constraints of the other language. Rothman (2002) provides the example of a Salvadorian women, who applies the word *supermarketa* referring to a supermarket, while the word is clearly adapted phonologically, as an *-a* is added in the end to avoid the *t* in word final position, which very rarely occurs in the Spanish language. Rothman and Rell (2005) demonstrate the morphological adaptation with the example of the creation of new verbs with the help of the ending *-ear,* derived from the only ending *-ar* – out of the three possible endings: *-ar*, *-er* and *-ir* – which is active in Modern Spanish to form an infinitive: *telefonear, parquear, lunchear, watchear*. It is worth noting that out of these four examples only two are registered in the DRA, so *lunchear* and *watchear* would not be understood and used by monolingual Spanish speakers. The second

classification refers to what has already been discussed as the phenomenon of calquing (see section 3.2.), meanwhile, the third one coincides with the argument that code-switching is a rule-governed linguistic phenomenon (see section 3.5.), since it cannot occur at any random point of discourse. Rothman and Rell (2005, p. 5) claim that it is "a mark of bilingual competence that enables a particular cohort of people to select one language or another in order to increase effective communication". Then they continue with that "[t]his 'selection' of dual-language use accompanied by lexical adaptations serves as the creation of not only an individual identity but also a community identity". They agree with the viewpoint that the juxtaposition of English and Spanish within a conversation is a sign of belonging to a community that embraces not only both languages but also both cultures as their own. We will follow the description given by Rothman and Rell (2005) when we investigate in this study whether the members of the Hispanic bilingual community in Miami also speak Spanglish.

Friedman (2001) claims that each region in the United States has its own Spanglish. This statement confirms our argument that the language use of each bilingual speech community should be investigated separately, as the way how they use the two languages simultaneously may vary from region to region.

As we can see from what has been discussed above, several different attempts have been made to describe Spanglish. There is not a general consensus among linguists what Spanglish really is, but it is undebatable that there is an English-Spanish language contact phenomenon that takes place in the United States, and it is the result of the juxtaposition of elements of these two languages during the same conversation, or in other words, the amalgamation of the two languages and as well as of the two cultures, since this peculiar language use expresses the sense of belonging to the Hispanic community in the United States, even if it sometimes has negative social judgement.

3.8. Spanglish versus pidgins and creoles

It has been argued in the previous section that Spanglish should not be considered as a language, yet sometimes it is compared to pidgin or creole languages. For instance, Tío (1954), having examined Papiamento, an Afro-Iberian creole language, concluded that the

same process would happen to Puerto Rican Spanish, if the speakers continued to let Anglicisms “invade” the Spanish language. To be able to assert that Spanglish is not a pidgin or creole language, first we should describe what kind of languages these terms define.

Thomason (2001) explains pidgins and creoles as the result of extreme language mixture, so they are types of contact languages. A contact language can be defined as “any new language that arise in a contact situation” (Thomason, 2001, p. 158). Furthermore, its lexicon and grammatical structures cannot primarily derive from the same source language, so it is not the result of the modification of one earlier language. For this reason, it does not belong to any language family. “Pidgins and creoles emerge in contexts in which people from different linguistic background need to talk to each other” (Thomason, 2001, p. 158). Based on only this description, Spanglish could also be a pidgin or a creole.

However, Thomason (2001, p. 159) depicts pidgin as a language that is the result of a language contact situation where the members of the two linguistic groups do not learn each other’s language, which is clearly not true about the Hispanic population in the United States, since many can speak in English, too. The emergence of pidgin occurs because instead of learning the other group’s language, the speakers develop a new language, which typically applies the vocabulary of one of the languages involved (lexifier language), meanwhile the grammar does not come from the other language, but it is a “crosslanguage compromise” of the two languages. It is nobody’s native language, since it is typically used for limited purposes between the two groups, for example, for trading. Spanglish cannot be a pidgin, as it is used by the same speech community not by members of two language groups in order to communicate with each other. It is also applied in various everyday situations, not only for limited purposes.

As opposed to pidgin, creole is the native language of a speech community (Thomason, 2001, p. 159). It is also the result of contact situations, and their lexicon typically comes from one of the languages, while its grammar is, just like in the case of pidgins, a “crosslanguage compromise of the languages of its creators” (Thomason, 2001, p. 160). Some creoles are nativized pidgins because with time they became the main language of the community and the first language of the following generations. Thomason (2001, p. 161) also affirms that “pidgins and creoles arise because speakers of the various other languages in the new contact situation have little access to the lexifier language to learn it »properly«”; however, it cannot always be supposed that there is a desire to learn that language, as

different social factors can come into play. We can argue that the Hispanic population do not usually show hostile behaviour against the English language, and they also have access to it, since it is that language that is used in institutional settings in the country. Moreover, a significant amount of the Hispanic population can speak this language.

When it comes to the English-Spanish language contact situation in the United States, it can be argued that it has not resulted in the evolution of a pidgin or creole language, since most of the Hispanic population is bilingual, which means that they are able to communicate with monolingual English speakers, so there is no need for a new language to arise so that the two linguistic groups could understand each other.

4. METHODOLOGY

The methodology followed in our study had a multiple status, as we will see later on. For example, casual conversations of English-Spanish bilingual speakers were observed in order to investigate whether they use both English and Spanish during their everyday conversations. We also examined if both the English and Spanish languages are used, then which of these languages occurred more often, to find out the dominant language of the speech community. Furthermore, we investigated the lexicon examining the situation when the two languages were juxtaposed within one conversation, whether the words originating from one language were adapted into the other language phonologically and morphologically — these words comprised lexical borrowings — or whether no alternation occurred. If the latter took place, then the word or phrase was not "inserted" in the other language. Sometimes a word was uttered without any phonological changes, that is, it remained in its original language and the speaker switched from one language to the other. In contrast, if the word was adapted, then it might gradually become part of the lexicon of the language and not just the variety spoken by the speech community. A final stage of the process of this adaptation was found when the word is started to be used by monolingual speakers. We also identified a few word categories that were borrowed because this could give some insight into the intensity of this contact situation.

The lexicon of the discourse was also analyzed in order to find lexical borrowings or code-switches. The lexical items considered to be borrowings were examined to check

whether they were listed in the DRAE, if they had an English origin but uttered as an integrated part of the Spanish language. We also investigated whether the borrowed words were listed in the American Heritage Dictionary. If so, then we looked at whether they were of Spanish origin but uttered in an English environment. If a word was found in the dictionary, it was an instance of language borrowing due to the fact that it was accepted and understood by monolinguals. If the word was not listed the dictionary, then it was labelled as speech borrowing, a loanword only used by the speakers.

Then, we also examined the types of code-switching found in the discourse dividing them into the categories suggested by Poplack (1980): tag-switching, intra-sentential or inter-sentential code-switching. We also attempted to determine the socio-pragmatic functions of the code-switches found in the discourse based on the functions proposed by Montes-Alcalá (2005) ― namely, quotation, emphasis, clarification or elaboration, parenthetical comments, idiomatic expressions or linguistic routines, triggered switches, stylistic switches, lexical need, free switches, and secret code switches―, and we finally investigated which function or functions were more likely to be fulfilled when the speakers code-switched.

4.1. Quantitative method, qualitative method or mixed methods research

To be able to state what kind of method is used to collect and analyze the data in this research, first the notions of quantitative and qualitative research methods and their "fusion", mixed research method should be discussed.

In order to differentiate these methods, it is not enough to state that quantitative method uses figures, whereas qualitative method do not. Dörnyei (2007, p. 24) affirms that "the general ideological orientation underlying the study, the method of data collection applied, the nature of the collected data, and the method of data analysis used to process the data and obtain results" should all be considered. He distinguishes these two research types as "[q]uantitative research involves data collection procedures that result primarily in numerical data which is then analysed primarily by statistical methods" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 24). As opposed to this, "[q]ualitative research involves data collection procedures that result primarily in open-ended, non-numerical data which is then analysed primarily by non-

statistical methods" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 24). The distinction between these two research paradigms can also be made by observing the following contrastive patterns (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 29):

> *(a,) »Categorizing the world« (QUAN: predetermined numerical category system; QUAL: emergent, flexible word coding).*
>
> *(b,) »Perceiving individual diversity« (QUAN: using large samples to iron out any individual idiosyncrasies; QUAL: focusing on the unique meaning carried by individual organisms).*
>
> *(c,) »Analysing data« (QUAN: relying on the formalized system of statistics, QUAL: relying on the researcher's individual sensitivity).*[16]

Dörnyei (2007) claims that the main characteristics of quantitative research are: using numbers, a priori categorization, variables rather than cases, statistics and the language of statistics, standardized procedures to assess objective reality, and quest for generalizability and universal laws. Whereas, qualitative research is characterized by the emergent research design, the nature of qualitative data, the natural research settings, insider meaning, small sample size, interpretive analysis (Dörnyei, 2007).

It is important to state that when an investigation is carried out, the distinction between quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis is not always clear-cut, hence these two methods are not always exclusive, but they can be combined into what is called mixed methods research.

4.2. The Method

The research method employed in this study can be identified as qualitative due to the fact that data is collected in a way that is typical of qualitative research rather than quantitative one, as the recordings and transcripts found in the corpus were used and analyzed as a sample of the language use of a speech community. The objective of the present research was to describe natural linguistic phenomena, and they were only observed and not manipulated — as it usually occurs in case of a quantitative research. As opposed to

[16] QUAN refers to quantitative method, and QUAL refers to qualitative method (abbreviations used by Dörnyei)

this, one could argue that the analysis of data resembles the characteristics of quantitative data analysis since the lexicon applied in the sample seems to be analyzed quantitatively: the number of Spanish words was compared with the number of English words used in the conversations. Moreover, the number of lexical borrowings were also compared to that of single-word or phrase-long code-switches. Furthermore, among the lexical borrowings the amount of language borrowings was compared to speech borrowings – lexical items that are not included in the DRAE as existing Spanish words of English origin or in the American Heritage Dictionary as existing English words of Spanish origin. It is true that we employed numbers and percentages, but the analysis of the data is rather qualitative since the identification, interpretation and analysis of the patterns and phenomena found in the discourse depended on the researcher's judgement.

The present research is a case study due to the fact that it investigates the "particularity and complexity of a single case" (Stake, 1995, p. XI), in this case, the unique language use of the Hispanic bilingual community of Miami, Florida. More precisely, it can be identified as an intrinsic case study, since it examines a particular situation with no intention to use it to draw generalizations about the language use of every bilingual speaker regardless of the languages they speak, not even about the whole Hispanic bilingual population of the United States.

The advantage of a case study is that it "is an excellent method for obtaining a thick description of a complex social issue embedded in a cultural context" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 155), such as the language use of the bilingual speech community as a sign of their "bi-cultural" identity, which may not be observed during an experimental study. Natural data provides a great opportunity to observe language use in its everyday context; nonetheless, a possible disadvantage of this kind of data collection is that the results may change. For example, when it comes to code-switching, such factors as the speakers or the topic they talk about can generate more or less code-switching. Consequently, observational method is not the most effective to be employed when the aim of the investigation is the grammatical structure of code-switching. MacSwan and McAlister (2010, as cited in Munarriz & Parafita, 2014, p. 9) describe three limitations of this method: the lack of negative evidence, the induction, and the difficulty of error identification. From natural data the researcher cannot conclude that just because a phenomenon has not been found, it is unlikely to occur. Furthermore, speakers in natural settings may make unconscious mistakes, and these

mistakes may mislead the researcher. As opposed to this, experimental methods, according to Dörnyei (2007), provide a controlled environment with consciously manipulated processes, achieving this way the emergence of the phenomenon that the research aims to observe and analyze. As the aim of this research is to observe the language use of the members of the Hispanic bilingual community of Miami in their everyday context and the linguistic phenomena that occur and not to investigate a specific grammatical structure, we consider that natural data collection was an appropriate method for this purpose.

The data that we analyzed is qualitative, so as the way how we analyzed it, but what does qualitative data analysis mean? Compared to quantitative analysis, where statistical techniques are used, "[w]orking with naturally occurring data is inevitably a messy enterprise" (Leung et al., 2004, p. 242). It involves a wide range of activities "from imaginative and artful speculation to following well-defined analytic moves, from deductive categorization to inductive pattern finding" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 242). It can follow two different analytical approaches: subjective intuition or formalized analytical procedures. The former is explained by Dörnyei (2007, p. 244) as "find[ing] a creative way out of the maze", which allows the researcher to set up new theories freely; meanwhile formalized analytical procedures "help us to uncover the hidden meaning in a systematic, step-by-step approach". Dörnyei (2007) views that "rigorous flexibility" and "disciplined artfulness" should be achieved. In this research, we followed preexistent categories, but deciding for instance the function of every code-switching that takes place in the data depended on the researcher's own intuition, since many factors can intervene when a switch between languages in a conversation takes place.

3.3. The Corpus

The conversations analyzed in the present study are casual conversations among Spanish-English bilingual residents in Miami, Florida. These conversations are part of the Bangor Miami Corpus[17]. We have chosen to analyze five conversations with the total length of 3 hours 2 minutes and 40 seconds. We have chosen these conversations with the intention to be able to analyze the language use of speakers of different age groups, of both sexes and

[17] https://biling.talkbank.org/access/Bangor/Miami.html

some of them were born in Miami, while others were born outside the United States and immigrated later either during their childhood or when they were already adults. This way the only common feature that they have is that they belong to the bilingual speech community of this region, since the aim of this study was to qualitatively describe the language use of the members of this community.

The conversations were recorded in a convenient place for the participants, and the informants were invited to talk freely about whatever topic they wanted to. They were asked to fill out a questionnaire, so that information concerning their age, gender, occupation, birthplace, and locations where they had lived could be obtained. The recordings were transcribed by trained transcribers, and the words uttered are categorized according to the criterion whether they are uttered in English, in Spanish or could be in both languages. The last group typically include proper nouns, such as names of people or places. In general, we accepted this categorization, although we reexamined all the words in order to determine if we could find any lexical borrowings.

The first conversation took place between a 57-year-old man and a 44-year-old woman. He was born in La Habana, Cuba, and arrived in Miami when he was 11 years old, so he was brought up in Cuba and in Miami. His highest education level is high school, and he works as a criminal investigator. The other participant was born in La Habana, Cuba, but she lived in Madrid, New York, the Dominican Republic before she settled down in Miami, where she has lived for 20 years. She was brought up in Cuba and in Madrid. She is a university graduate and works in a hospital. They both have spoken Spanish since they were 2 years old or younger. He started to speak English in secondary school, while she started in primary school. They both consider themselves to be fairly confident in both languages in extended conversations. The informal conversation was recorded in a casual setting, in his house. The conversation is 33 minutes and 52 seconds long.[18]

The second conversation was recorded at one of the participants' workplace while he had a conversation with his mother. The mother was born and raised in Cuba, and she left the country when she was 18 years old. She lived for 35 years in New York, and she has lived in Miami for 26 years. She started to speak in English as an adult, meanwhile, she has spoken Spanish since she was 2 years old or younger. She claims to be confident in Spanish

[18] The recording of the conversation with its transcript is found at:
https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha

in extended conversations, but she is only confident in English in basic conversations. She is retired, and she only finished junior high school. The other participant was born in New York and lived there for 24 years, then he moved to Miami, where he has lived for 30 years. His highest education level is high school, and he works as a police officer. He started to speak Spanish as an adult, meanwhile, he has spoken English since he was 2 years old or younger. He is confident in both languages in extended conversations. The conversation is 41 minutes long.[19]

The third conversation took place between three co-workers during their lunch break. The first participant is 37 years old, he was born and raised in Puerto Rico, he left for Miami when he was 20 years old and has lived there for 18 years. He is a university graduate and works as a computer technician. He started to speak Spanish since he was 2 years old or younger. He is confident in Spanish in extended conversations, and fairly confident in English in extended conversations. The second participant is 52 years old, she was born in Cuba, but left the country when she was 5 years old. She lived in London for two years, then moved to New Jersey. She lived there for 35 years, then moved to Miami, where she has lived for 19 years. Her highest education level is high school, and she works as a personnel technician. She started speaking Spanish when she was 2 years old or younger and English when in primary school. She is confident in both languages in extended conversations. The third participant is 43 years old. He was born in New York and moved to Puerto Rico when he was 15 years old. He lived there for 12 years, then he has lived in Miami for 17 years. He is a university graduate and works as a personnel technician. He started to speak English when he was 2 years old or younger, but Spanish as an adult. He is confident in English in extended conversations, and fairly confident in Spanish in extended conversations. The conversation is 43 minutes and 2 seconds long.[20]

The fourth conversation was recorded between two co-workers at their workplace. One of them is 29 years old, she was born in Costa Rica but left the country for Miami when she was 4 years old. She has lived there for 25 years. She started to acquire English when she was 2 years old or younger and Spanish when she was 4. She is confident in English in extended conversations, while she is confident in Spanish in basic conversations. The other

[19] The recording of the conversation with its transcript is found at: https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha
[20] The recording of the conversation with its transcript is found at: https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha

participant is 22 years old. She was born in the Dominican Republic but left the country for Miami when she was 3 years old and has lived there for 19 years. She starts to speak Spanish when she was 2 years old or younger and English when started primary school. She is confident in English in extended conversations and fairly confident in Spanish in extended conversations. They are both university graduate and work as legal secretaries. The conversation is 31 minutes and 26 seconds long.[21]

The fifth conversation took place between a grandmother and her granddaughter at a friend's house. The granddaughter is 13 years old, and she was born in Miami where she has lived since then. She is a student. She started to speak both English and Spanish when she was 2 years old or younger. She is confident in English in extended conversations, and in Spanish in basic conversations. The grandmother is 63 years old. She is a university graduate, and she is an accountant. She was born and raised in Cuba and left the country for Miami when she was 17 years old. She has lived in Miami for 47 years. She started to speak Spanish when she was 2 years old or younger and English when she was an adult. She is confident in both languages in extended conversations. The conversation is 33 minutes and 20 seconds long.[22]

5. RESULTS

This section of the TFM presents the findings of the research and discusses the analysis of the results. Then, we demonstrate examples of the different language phenomena found in the data.

5.1. Results

[21] The recording of the conversation with its transcript is found at: https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre04.cha
[22] The recording of the conversation with its transcript is found at: https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre08.cha

Total number of words uttered in the conversations	**30,605 (100%)**
Number of words uttered in Spanish	14,703 (48.04%)
Number of words uttered in English	15,256 (49.85%)
Number of words uttered in both languages[23]	646 (2.11%)

Table 5. Division of lexicon according to language used

Lexical items originating from the other language	**194 (100%)**
Lexical borrowings	8 (4.12%)
Single-word or phrase-long code-switches	186 (95.88%)

Table 6. Division of the lexical items originating from the other language

Lexical borrowings	**8 (100%)**
Language borrowings	5 (62.5%)
Speech borrowings	3 (37.5%)

Table 7. Distribution of lexical borrowings

Code-switches	**674 (100%)**
Tag-switches	59 (8.75%)
Intra-sentential code-switches	298 (44.21%)
Inter-sentential code-switches	317 (47.04%)

Table 8. Distribution of code-switches according to their type

[23] These words are proper names, brand names, etc. that are counted as part of the lexicon of both languages

Code-switches	**674 (100%)**
Quotation	34 (5.04%)
Emphasis	49 (7.27%)
Clarification or elaboration	101 (14.99%)
Parenthetical comment	17 (2.52%)
Idiomatic expression or linguistic routine	131 (19.44%)
Triggered switch	49 (7.27%)
Stylistic switch	2 (0.3%)
Lexical need	174 (25.81%)
Free switch	117 (17.36%)
Secret code switch	0 (0%)

Table 9. Distribution of code-switches according to their function

5.2. Analysis of the results

Before having started to analyze the data, we expected Spanish to be the dominant language of the discourse due to the fact that the knowledge of this language is the common feature of the members of the Hispanic community, and in the region 71.51.% of the population belongs to this ethnic group. We also suspected that the speakers would code-switch while they are speaking, since they have access to both languages, therefore they are likely to use both in their everyday interactions. We presumed to find that the intensity of the language contact is casual, since we highly doubted that they would borrow other than content words. Furthermore, we suspected that they would use more single-word or phrase-long code-switches than lexical borrowings. When it comes to code-switching, we supposed that we would find all three types of code-switching (tag-switches, intra-sentential and inter-sentential switches), and that the code-switches employed by the speakers would fulfil all the different functions proposed by Montes-Alcalá (2005), but the secret code switch would be the least common, as when two bilinguals talk to each other and there is no monolingual third party present, then this function seems to be unnecessary, since there is no need to exclude that third person from the conversation. Finally, we presumed that the members of this bilingual community use Spanglish.

One of the aims of this study is to identify the dominant language of the Hispanic bilingual community of Miami. Table 5 shows that the number of words uttered in English or in Spanish are nearly the same, so it is not possible to state that either English or Spanish is the dominant language of the community, as the participants used both languages during their conversations; however, the dominant language is possible to be identified in the personal level in case of some of the informants, being English of the younger participants and Spanish of an elderly participant. Others used both languages in an extended way. We can conclude that it is a complex issue to determine the dominant language of the community, not to mention that several factors can have an impact on the language they use, such as topic, language proficiency of the listeners, etc.

5.2.1. Lexical borrowings

Since we differentiate lexical borrowings from single-word or phrase-long code-switching based on whether they are phonologically or morphologically adapted in the recipient language and can be understood by monolingual speakers, the lexical analysis of the data show that the bilingual speakers use significantly less lexical borrowings than single-word or phrase-long code-switching (see Table 6). The most likely reason for this can be that there are many competent bilingual members of this speech community, and they find it more precise or more accurate to refer to a specific notion or object in the other language — as we have already discussed in the case when code-switching serves the lexical need function (see section 3.6.). Another explanation can be that they meet the word or expression more often in the language they utter it, even if they know how to express it in their other language. For example: in the fragment "*cuando salimos que nos îbamos para el* ***bicycle shop***"[24] we cannot undoubtedly state that the speaker does not know the Spanish expression "*tienda de bicicletas*", but he may see this sign written on the shop very often or he may feel that the English expression can identify more precisely that specific shop he visited.

The lexical borrowings observed in the conversations belong to the class of content words: five nouns: "*yuppie", "hall", "van", "voleibol", "bistec"*, two adjectives: "*ripiado*" and "*estrech*" and a verb: "*parquear*". Based on these lexical items, it can be concluded that

[24] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 58

the contact situation according to the borrowability scale proposed by Thomason (2001) is a casual contact situation. Nevertheless, as we discussed before, one of the disadvantages of using natural data is that just because we did not find in our data lexical borrowings from other word classes, we cannot be certain that other than content words are never borrowed.

The lexical borrowings that are found in the data are divided into two groups: language borrowings, found in the dictionaries and understood by monolingual speakers too, and speech borrowings, which are not considered to be part of the recipient language's lexicon, as they are not listed in the dictionary.

5.2.1.2. Language borrowings

It is important to state that the language borrowings found in the conversations are not necessarily the result of the contact situation of English and Spanish in Miami, as these lexical items are also used by monolinguals from other parts of the world. This means that they could have entered the language at any time, since these two languages came into contact centuries ago. For example, the word "*hall*" is listed in the DRAE as a word that originates from English, but it is difficult to know when and how it entered the Spanish language. Another example is the word "*ripiado*", the past participle of the verb "*ripiar*", which is used in Cuba and the Dominican Republic according to the DRAE. It is very likely to have been borrowed from English, as it means 'rip' and its form resembles this word, too.

In the conversations only words originating from English that entered the Spanish language have been found, but as we could already see before, the inexistence of a phenomenon in natural data does not imply that the phenomenon never occurs; therefore, we cannot conclude that Spanish words cannot or have not been borrowed by the English language.

5.2.1.3. Speech borrowings

Speech borrowings are those lexical items that are integrated into the recipient language, but they are not found in the dictionary, since they are not likely to be understood by monolingual speakers.

An example from the corpus is the word "*yuppie*"[25], which is uttered in a completely Spanish context in the uttereance: "*un negro pare / parecía pelo de **yuppie**"*, and phonologically integrated into the Spanish language: /ʤupi/ instead of its English pronunciation: /jʌpi/. However, it is impossible to determine whether it is morphologically integrated into the Spanish language, since it is a single noun, which bears a zero morpheme in both languages. As this word is not found in the DRAE, it is considered a speech borrowing.

Another speech borrowing is the word "*estrech*"[26], which is clearly phonologically integrated into the Spanish language, as it is pronounced /estretʃ/ where the original English cluster in the word 'stretch' /stretʃ/, is dissolved by adding the sound *e-* at the beginning of the word. This is a common phenomenon when a word is integrated in the Spanish language, for example: the English word 'stress' is borrowed by the Spanish language as *estrés*. This word is not found in the DRAE, hence it is also considered as speech borrowing.

The third lexical item that is classified as speech borrowing is "*van*" in the following sentence: "*una patrulla o / o una **van***"[27]. We consider this to be a borrowed lexical item, as it is phonologically adapted to the recipient language, since it is pronounced /ban/ instead of /væn/; however, we cannot identify whether the word is morphologically adapted to Spanish because it is a singular noun that has a zero morpheme in both languages.

5.2.1.4. Calques

We differentiate lexical borrowings from calques, where only the meaning is borrowed but not the form. In our data four calques were found.

In the utterance "*uno de los de los comisionados que **corrió***"[28] the Spanish verb "*correr*" which means 'run' is used based on the expression 'run for commissioner' instead

[25] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 1055
[26] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre08.cha: 432
[27] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 871
[28] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 835

of the Spanish expression "*presentar su candidatura a comisionado*". The sentence should be "*uno de los comisionados que se presentó*", but the speaker uses a loan translation instead.

In the sentence "*Tú **has crecido** tomates mucho?*"[29] the Spanish verb "*crecer*" which means 'grow' with the sense of becoming bigger or taller is used with a different meaning that only exist in English, namely, to make a plant grow, which should be "*plantar*" or "*cultivar*" in Spanish.

Another calque that appears in the data three times is the word "*rentar*"[30] with the meaning of 'rent', whereas this word in Spanish means 'yield' or 'produce'.

Finally, "*complementar*" is also considered to be a calque because it is used with the meaning of 'compliment', meanwhile the word in Spanish originally means 'complement' or 'add'.

5.2.2. Code-switches

This section is dedicated to analyse the different types of code-switches found in the data. First, we deal with single-word or phrase-long code-switches, which were differentiated from lexical borrowing in a way that they are not integrated into the language used immediate before and after them. After that, we present the three types of code-switches proposed by Poplack (1980) with examples. Finally, we discuss the different socio-pragmatic functions that the code-switches found in the conversations serve.

5.2.2.1. Single-word or phrase-long code-switches

The results clearly show that the speakers of this bilingual community quite often use single-word or phrase-long code-switches. The main function of this switch is lexical need. For example, "*speed bump*" [31] uttered in a Spanish context, instead of the Spanish

[29] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 167
[30] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 52, 938, 948
[31] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 20

expression "*resalto"* or *"reductor de velocidad"*. However, this type of code-switch sometimes can also serve as emphasis, such as "*Con leche o agua o **WHAT***?[32]

5.2.2.2. Types of code-switches

All three types of code-switches proposed by Poplack (1980) are found in the conversations. As Table 8 shows, tag-switches seem to be the least frequent being 8.75% of all the switches. Intra-sentential and inter-sentential switches both occur more frequently than tag switches, being inter-sentential a slightly bit more common (47.04%) than intra-sentential (44.21%). It can be concluded that the bilingual speakers of this community are nearly as likely to switch from one language to the other not only when starting a new sentence or clause but also within the boundaries of a sentence or clause.

To illustrate these three types of code-switches some examples found in the conversations are presented.

Examples of tag switches:

- "*So where is all that extra money that they made when the / when the boom was going on? **TÚ SABES?** It was misspent."*[33]
- "*LAS CHIQUITITAS ENTRAN A LA CASA CADA RATO PARA **you know** JODER EL PARQUE*"[34]
- "***OYE**, umm is XXX number is such and such and such*?[35]

Examples of intra-sentential code-switches:

- "*Y AQUÍ ANTES was half way*".[36]
- "*ÉL LE METIÓ UNO / UNA PATADA, PUES NO LO MATÓ, ESTABA TODAVÍA moving a little bit.*"[37]

[32] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 61
[33] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 326-328
[34] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 286
[35] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre04.cha: 293
[36] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 147
[37] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 475

- "*He / he / he needs to YA YA PARAR*"[38]

Examples of inter-sentential switches:

- "*PERO SÍ SE PUDIERAN PONER UN PAR DE TUBOS O ALGO, so we could uh install the hammock.*"[39]
- "*ELLA MIRÓ ARRIBA ASÍ EN LA OFICINA and saw a dead roach inside the glass there*."[40]
- "*Well, tell me! QUÉ PASÓ CON EL VOLEIBOL ESE TUYO? CÓMO FUE?*"[41]

5.2.2.3. Functions of code-switches

In order to determine the socio-pragmatic functions of the code-switches, we use the classification proposed by Montes-Alcalá (2005): (1) quotation, (2) emphasis, (3) clarification or elaboration, (4) parenthetical comments, (5) idiomatic expressions or linguistic routines, (6) triggered switches, (7) stylistic switches, (8) lexical need, (9) free switches, and (10) secret code switches. In the conversations we found examples of all but the last function. First, we discuss the percentage of each function found in the data, then we present examples of each of them from the conversations. It is important to emphasise that assigning a function to each switch is a difficult enterprise, since we cannot ask the speaker to verbalise their thoughts when they were uttering that part of the speech, so the researcher has to rely on their own judgement. During the analysis of the conversations, we have focused on various factors that could intervene not just the immediate context but the topic and the conversational situation, too.

The total of 674 switches found in the conversations, according to the function which they serve, can be divided into nine categories out of the ten categories mentioned above (see Table 9). The most common function of a switch is to fulfil a lexical need (25.81%), whereas a switch in style can only be observed in 2 occasions (0.3%). In these occasions the speaker may know the word or the expression in the other language, — in fact, sometimes the translation is used later, for instance "*blender*"[42] is uttered in a Spanish context and later

[38] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre04.cha: 318
[39] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 85
[40] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 492
[41] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre08.cha: 37-39
[42] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 60

the speaker also refers to the same object as "*batidora*"[43]. However, in many cases the speaker finds it more appropriate to convey the meaning by uttering it in that language even if it results in a switch from one language to the other. However, we cannot state that the switch never happens, since the speaker does not know or cannot retrieve the word in the other language. Many switches are classified as idiomatic expression or linguistic routine (19.44%), where the expression is uttered in the original language to convey the meaning more effectively. Free switches are also relatively common (17.36%). These switches are labelled as free switches either because they can fulfil more functions, or it is impossible to interpret their function. As it has been discussed before, since we cannot ask the speakers to interpret themselves why they switched the language, on many occasions it is difficult to determine what function the switch serves. 14.99% of the switches occurred in order to clarify or elaborate on what had just been uttered. It is quite common that the speaker feels the need to explain or amplify their message in the other language. In the conversations we could find the same amount of emphasis and triggered switches (7.27%). Another function is quotation, which means the 5.04% of all the switches. It is not very common to quote what others said but when speakers do it, they tend to use the language in which it was uttered. Parenthetical comment is one of the less frequent functions of code-switching in the data (2.52%), meanwhile a switch in style can only be observed in two occasions (0.3%). None of the switches served the function of secret code. We can argue that they did not feel the need to switch the language in order to exclude a third party from the conversation.

Finally, some examples of the nine functions found in the data are presented.

(1) Quotation:

- "*Y DIJIMOS / DIJIMOS NOSOTROS hey where did that Pink dog come from?*"[44]
- "*Y TÚ LA PREGUNTAS AHÍ did you apply already on xxx?*"[45]
- "*And then she would be like QUÉ ES LO QUE ELLA QUIERE? QUÉ ES UNA cookie?*"[46]

(2) Emphasis:

- "*So, if they have to go to a regular restaurant ES CARO*"[47]

[43] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 73
[44] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 1064-1065
[45] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 81
[46] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre04.cha: 1046-1048
[47] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 658

- "*Con leche o agua o WHAT*?[48]
- "*Definitely, it doesn't have NO TIENE / NO TIENE SENTIDO.*"[49]

(3) Clarification or elaboration:

- "*Let's bring it back to where we are, DONDE ESTAMOS AHORA.*"[50]
- "*Where did you buy it? DÓNDE LO CONSEGUISTE?*"[51]
- "*Van a hacer la cocina. THEY ARE GONNA REDO THE KITCHEN*"[52]

(4) Parenthetical comment:

- "*ya estamos juntos veintiséis veintiocho años. Casados veintiséis años y juntos veintiocho. Ya olvídate, ya no hay remedio. I'M STUCK WITH THAT BITCH NOW.*"[53]
- "*SI TÚ ME FALTAS UN DÍA POR DIVORCIO O MUERTE, TE DIGO EH DESDE ESTE MOMENTO EN TU CARA ESCÚCHAME BIEN, VOY A GUATEMALA, COMPRO VEINTE TREINTA CHIVAS O CHIVOS or whatever the fuck.*"[54]
- "*NO VAMOS A SALIR DE AQUÍ CON OLOR A COMIDA. I'm gonna smell like a fried chicken.*"[55]

(5) Idiomatic expressions or linguistic routines:

- "*So where is all that extra money that they made when the / when the boom was going on? TÚ SABES? It was misspent."*[56]
- "*DESPUÉS DE / DESPUÉS DICEN ESO Y QUIEREN MÁS. No way.*"[57]
- "*Yeah, they did. And, TÚ SABES, it wasn't the same.*"

(6) Triggered switches:

- "*YO TENGO UNA QUE CADA VEZ QUE VAMOS* ***camping*** *we take it, and I set it up in the / in the campground.*"[58]

[48] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 61
[49] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 195
[50] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 332
[51] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 988-989
[52] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre08.cha: 633-634
[53] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 642-645
[54] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 648-651
[55] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 411-412
[56] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 326-328
[57] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 658
[58] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 79-80

- "*ÉL LE METIÓ UNO / UNA PATADA, PUES NO LO MATÓ, ESTABA TODAVÍA* ***moving*** *a little bit.*"[59]
- "*AH TÚ TENÍAS EL* ***lunch*** *that dinner the other day.*"[60]

(7) Stylistic switches:

- "*ME DIO UNA RABIA, COÑO. VAYA QUE YO, COMO… I hated those sons of bitches.*"[61]
- "*No, it's not. And when you're so young, and then you have kids, Y MIRA SE JODIÓ, [yeah] MIRA, she was with him for thirty years.*"[62]

(8) Lexical need:

- "*TÚ NO SABES QUE YA LA MATA MÍA DEL MANGO YA NO TIENE / YA NO LE QUEDA NI the stump.*"[63]
- "*AYER TUVIMOS ESTE UN GRUPO, NO SÉ SI FUERON A UN training bureau LOS ALEMANES.*"[64]
- "*BUENO, XXX TÚ SABES QUE LA SEMANA QUE VIENE SE ACABA EL COLEGIO, VIENE(N) LAS VACACIONES DE Easter.*"[65]

(9) Free switches:

- "*They all have pools. And then we came across this one, QUE LA ESTABAN VENDIENDO DESE ABRIL, EL VIEJITO SE HABÍA MUERTO. LA ESTABAN VENDIENDO DESDE ABRIL.*"[66]
- "*UN ABOGADO LE ESTABA ATRAVESÁNDOLE EL FONDILLO PARA QUE TRABAJARA CON ELLOS. ELLA MIRA PARA ARRIBA ASÍ EN LA OFICINA and saw a dead roach inside the glass there.*"[67]
- "*LIMPIÉ all the furniture and everything you know even nice Spic and Span, EL BAÑO, LA BAÑERA, LA DUCHA, BUENO, everything the glass.*"[68]

[59] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 475
[60] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 408
[61] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 936-938
[62] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre04.cha: 1171-1176
[63]2https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre03.cha: 97
[64] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 357
[65] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre08.cha: 505-506
[66] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre01.cha: 104-108
[67] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/spa/sastre02.cha: 496-497
[68] https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami/eng/sastre03.cha: 924

No code-switching was found in the conversation with the tenth function proposed by Montes-Alcalá (2005), namely the secret code function, therefore no examples of this function can be presented.

5.2.3. Spanglish in Miami?

To answer the question whether the members of the Hispanic bilingual speech community use Spanglish when they maintain a conversation with each other, we followed the structural description of Spanglish provided by Rothman and Rell (2005) (see section 3.7.). The discourse of the five conversations can be described as Spanglish, since instances of all three subdivisions provided by these scholars could be identified in the data. First, phonological, morphological or morphophonological adaptation of lexical units were observed (for example, *estrech, parquear*). Furthermore, semantically adapted lexical elements were found (for example, *correr* with the meaning of 'run for commissioner'). Finally, several instances of code-switching were identified (674 in total) in all five conversations.

6. CONCLUSION

In this TFM we argued that when two groups of people, who are speakers of different languages, get into contact, the languages that they speak are very likely to get into contact, too. This way the languages influence each other, and as a result of this contact situation, different language phenomena emerge, such as bilingualism, borrowing, or code-switching. These phenomena have been investigated for decades by linguists. We presented the different viewpoints of several linguists and the definitions that they provide to describe these terms. We also discussed how borrowing can be differentiated from code-switching. Next, we addressed the issue of Spanglish, where we also found that scholars adopt diverse postures, and later we could see why Spanglish should not be considered as an individual language.

The present study investigated the English-Spanish language contact phenomenon in a bilingual speech community in Miami, Florida. This language contact is the result of the constant immigration of the Hispanic people to this region, as well as to many other parts of the United States. In order to obtain information about the language use of this

Hispanic bilingual speech community, the discourse of five casual conversations between English-Spanish bilinguals has been analyzed with the intention to provide a qualitative description and analysis of the linguistic phenomena that emerge due to the long-term parallel use of these two languages.

First, we intended to identify the dominant language of the community based on which language is used more often. It is not possible to determine the dominant language of the community, since both languages were used with nearly of the same extension; however personal differences were found among the informants. It is also important to state that many factors can influence which language is applied, for example, the topic of the conversation.

Then, the attention was focused on the lexicon of the conversations, more precisely, how these two languages influence each other on the lexical level due to their parallel everyday use by the members of this speech community. The words or phrases that are originally part of the lexicon of the other language and not that of their immediate linguistic context were investigated according to the criterion of whether they were adapted phonologically and morphologically or not by the context language. If they were adapted, they were classified as lexical borrowings, and if not, they were considered as one-word or phrase code-switching, that is, the speaker switches from the context language to the other language to utter the word or phrase. From the results, we could conclude that the speakers of this bilingual community do not tend to borrow lexical items from the other language (although some borrowed lexical items have been observed), but they rather prefer to switch the language even if it serves only to utter a single word or expression. In the data we could only find content words that were borrowed, therefore we supposed that the language contact situation is casual.

We also examined what type of code-switching the speakers employ: tag-switches, intra-sentential or inter-sentential code-switches. All three types were found in the data, although tag-switches were less common than the other two types.

Furthermore, we also classified the code-switches found in the conversations according to their function. The results show that the switches served out of the ten functions proposed by Montes-Alcalá (2005) all but one function (secret code function). We also argued that sometimes it is difficult to determine the function of the switch due to the fact that several factors can intervene, and the researcher must follow their own

judgement. To be able to pinpoint the exact function of all the switches, it would be better to carry out some research in which, after the conversations, the informant could be asked to explain why they felt the need — let it be conscious or unconscious — to code-switch.

It is obvious that the five casual conversations with the length of 3 hours 2 minutes and 40 seconds used as data do not contain all the lexical changes and tendencies of code-switching. However, the results of this research can provide us with some insight into how the members of this Hispanic bilingual speech community juxtapose both English and Spanish, and this produces different language contact phenomena, such as borrowing and code-switching. In particular, we showed that the latter phenomenon was more often found. Some of the limitations of our study refer to the lack of empirical studies that could be used to replicate these findings. Further empirical studies are therefore left as future research.

REFERENCES

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (2005). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bangor Miami Corpus
https://sla.talkbank.org/TBB/biling/Bangor/Miami

Barkin, F., Brandt, E. & Ornstein-Galicia, J. (Eds.) (1982). *Bilingualism and language contact: Spanish, English and Native American languages.* New York: NY Teachers College Press.

Becker, K. R. (1997). Spanish/English bilingual code-switching: A syncretic model. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe 22*(1), 3-30.

Belazi, H. M., Rubin, E. J. & Toribio, A. J. (1994). Code-switching and X-bar theory: the functional head constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry 25*(2), 221–237.

Bokamba, E. (1989). Are their syntactic constraints on code-mixing? *World Englishes, 8,* 277-292.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1989.tb00669.x

Campbell, L. (1998). *Historical linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Cashman, H. R. (2005). Review of Ilan Stavans' 'Spanglish': The making of a new American language. *Chasqui 34(1),* 216-219.

Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics 6th edition*. Oxford: Blackwell. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781444302776

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elías-Olivares, L. (Ed.) (1982). *Spanish in the US setting: Beyond the Southwest*. Rosslyn, VA: Clearinghouse for the National Association for Bilingual Education.

Elías-Olivares, L., Leone, E. A., Cisneros, R. & Gutiérrez, J. (Eds.) (1985). *Spanish use and public life in the US*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fishman, J. A. (2004). Multilingualism and non-English mother tongue. In Finegan, E. and Rickford, J. R. (Eds.) *Language in the USA: Themes for the twenty-first century*. (pp. 115-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fodde Melis, L. (2002). *Race, ethnicity, and dialects: Language policy and ethnic minorities in the United States*. Milano: FrancoAngeli s.r.l.

Friedman, R. (2001). Language purists dismayed by Spanglish. *Geolinguistics, 27*(1), 196-199.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (Eds.) (1992). *Language transfer in language learning: Revised edition.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/lald.5

González Echevarría, R. (1997, March 28). Is 'Spanglish' a language? *New York Times* Retrieved December 4, 2021, from https://www.nytimes.com/1997/03/28/opinion/is-spanglish-a-language.html

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, M. & Tadmor, U. (2009). The loanword typology project and the world loanword database. In Haspelmath, M. & Tadmor, U. (Eds). *Loanwords in the words languages: A cooperative handbook.* (pp. 1-34). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Heredia, R. R. & Altarriba, J. (2001). Bilingual Language Mixing: Why Do Bilinguals Code-Switch? *Current Directions in Psychological Science. 10*(5),164-168. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00140

Hernández, D. (2004, February 19). The language of multiculturalism. *Manchester Guardian Weekly*

Labov, W. (1989). The exact description of a speech community: Short a in Philadelphia. In Fasold, R. W. & Schiffrin, D. (Eds). *Language change and variation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Leung, C., Harris, R. & Rampton, B. (2004). Living with inelegance in qualitative research on task-based learning. In Norton, B. and Toohey, K. (Eds). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. (pp. 242-268) New York: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524834.013

Lipski, J. M. (2004). *Is Spanglish the third language of the South?: Truth and fantasy about U.S. Spanish.* Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. Retrieved November 21, 2021, from https://lavis.as.ua.edu/handouts/lipski.pdf

Lipski, J. M. (2007). Spanish, English, or Spanglish? Truth and consequences of U. S. Latino Bilingualism. In Echávez-Solano, N. and Dworkin y Méndez, K. C. (Eds.) *Spanish and Empire, Hispanic issues, 34.* (pp. 197-218). Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv16755vb.13

Mackey, W. F. (1967). *Bilingualism as a word problem*. Montreal: Harvest House.

Manfredi, S., Simeone-Senelle, M. & Tosco, M. (2015). Language contact, borrowing and codeswitching. In Mettouchi, A., Vanhove, M. & Caubet, D. (Eds.) *Corpus-based studies of lesser-described languages. The CorpAfroAs corpus of spoken AfroAsiatic languages.* (pp. 283-308). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.68.09man

Maroney, T. (1998, December 21). TV in a Spanglish accent. *Fortune* Retrieved November 21, 2021, from https://archive.fortune.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/1998/12/21/252704/index.htm

Matras, Y. (2007). The borrowability of grammatical categories. In Matras, Y. & Sakel, J. (Eds.) *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective.* (pp. 31-74) Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199192.31

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809873

Melissaropoulou, D. & Ralli, A. (2019). Revisiting the borrowability scale(s) of free grammatical elements: evidence from modern Greek contact induced varieties. *Journal of language contact, 12*, 707-736.
Retrieved December 4, 2021, from https://brill.com/view/journals/jlc/12/3/article-p707_707.xml?language=en

Montes-Alcalá, C. (2005). ¡Mándame un email! Cambio de códigos español-inglés online. In Ortiz López, L. A. & Lacorte, M. (Eds.) *Contactos y contextos lingüísticos. El Español en los Estados Unidos y en contacto con otras lenguas*. (pp. 287-300). Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Montes-Alcalá, C. (2009). Hispanics in the United States: More than Spanglish. *Camino real: estudios de las hispanidades norteamericanas, 0*, 97-115.
http://hdl.handle.net/10017/8302

Muysken, P. (1981). Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: the case for relexification. In Highfield, A. & Valdman, A. (Eds.) *Historicity and variation in Creole studies*. (pp. 52–78). Ann Arbor: Karoma.
https://hdl.handle.net/2066/14531

Muysken, P. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory. In Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.) *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. (pp. 177-198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620867.009

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling Languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. & Jake, J. L. (1995). Matching lemmas in a bilingual language competence and production model: evidence from intrasentencial code-switching. *Linguistics, 33*, 981-1024. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1995.33.5.981

Myers-Scotton, C. & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: the social functions of code-switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 13,* 5-20. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1977.13.5

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Language contact: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198299530.001.0001

Pfaff, C. W. (1979). Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language, 55*(2), 291-318. https://www.jstor.org/stable/412586?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español. Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics, 18,* 581-618. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

Poplack, S. (1987). Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. In Wande, E., Anward J., Nordberg, B., Steensland, L, Thelander, M., (Eds.) *Aspects of multilingualism: Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Symposium on Bilingualism.* (pp. 51-76). Uppsala: Borgströms.

Roca, A. & Lipski, J. M. (Eds.) (1993). *Spanish in the United States: Linguistic contact and diversity*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rothman, J. (2002). *The leveling of monolingual Spanish dialects resulting in a true dialect of Los Angeles: evidence from an interview with a Salvadorian woman*. Ms. UCLA, California: Los Angeles

Rothman, J. & Rell, A. B. (2005). A linguistic analysis of Spanglish: Relating language to identity. *Linguistics and Human Sciences, 1*(3), 515-536. https://doi.org/10.1558/lhs.2005.1.3.515

Sankoff, D. & Poplack, S. (1981). A formal grammar for code-switching. *Papers in Linguistics. 22*(1), 99-135. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818109370523

Silva-Corvalán, C. (1995). Lexico-syntactic modelling across the bilingual continuum. In: Fisiak, J. (Ed.) *Language change under contact conditions*. (pp. 253-270). Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110885170.253

Singh, R. (1985). Grammatical constraints on code-mixing: Evidence from Hindi-English. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics 30*(1), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008413100010677

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing.

Stavans, I. (2000). Spanglish: Tickling the tongue. *World literature today, 74*(3), 555-558. https://doi.org/10.2307/40155823

Stavans, I. (2003). *Spanglish: The Making of a New American Language*. New York: Rayo/Harper Collins.

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, S. G. & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tío, S. (1954). *Teoría de espanglish. A fuego lento, cien columnas de humor y una cornisa*. (pp. 60-65). Río Piedras: University of Puerto Rico.

Wherritt, I. & García, O. (Eds.) (1988). US Spanish: the language of Latinos. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 79.*

Zentella, A. C. (2016). Spanglish: Language Politics vs el habla del pueblo. In Tamargo, R., Mazak, C. & Parafita Couto, M. C. (Eds.) *Spanish-English Codeswitching in the Carribbean and the U.S.* (pp. 11-35). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ihll.11.01zen

RESUMEN

El presente TFM investiga el fenómeno del contacto lingüístico entre los idiomas inglés y español en los Estados Unidos. El primer apartado demuestra el marco histórico de dicho contacto junto con datos demográficos que indican que la población hispana de Estados Unidos es actualmente la minoría más grande. Después se desarrollan los diferentes conceptos lingüísticos que surgen como consecuencia del bilingüismo de esta población: préstamo lingüístico (*borrowing*) y alternancia de código (*code-switching*) junto con las posibles razones por las que los hablantes tienden a tomar prestadas palabras de la otra lengua o cambian de lengua durante una conversación. Además, se habla del fenómeno lingüístico denominado Spanglish que va intrínsicamente ligado al contacto de las dos lenguas en cuestión. La investigación utilizó cinco conversaciones casuales grabadas entre los miembros de una comunidad lingüística bilingüe en Miami, Florida para poder dar una descripción cualitativa del uso de lengua cotidiana de sus miembros. El fin de la investigación fue intentar determinar la lengua dominante de la comunidad y si utilizan más préstamos léxicos o prefieren alternan el código, aunque sea sólo para pronunciar una palabra o expresión en la otra lengua. Los préstamos léxicos se dividieron en dos grupos basados en el criterio de si figuran en el diccionario de la lengua receptora, es decir si son entendidos y utilizados por los hablantes monolingües o no lo son. También se investigaron las alternancias de código desde el punto de vista de su tipo y de su función. Se distinguen tres tipos de alternancia de código: alternancia por uso de muletilla (*tag-switching*), cambio intrasentencial (*intra-sentential switch*) y cambio intersentencial (*inter-sentential switch*). Desde la función socio-pragmática que puede tener una alternancia de código se diferencian diez tipos de funciones: citas, énfasis, aclaración o elaboración, comentarios parentéticos, expresiones idiomáticas o rutinas lingüísticas, cambios provocados, cambios estilísticos, necesidad léxica, cambios libres y cambio como código secreto. Finalmente se investiga si los miembros de a comunidad observada utilizan Spanglish.