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ABSTRACT

A great amount of sociolinguistic research in contact situations has centered on phonological and morphosyntactic variables, but studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations are scarce and incipient. Discourse-pragmatic features are syntactically optional elements that are used to guide, structure, or express a stance towards discourse (Pichler, 2013, p. 4). These features are hallmarks of grammaticalization because of their decategorialization to fulfill pragmatic functions (Brinton, 2006; Traugott, 1995). Their analysis in language contact situations can shed light on contact-induced change, since they occur on the periphery of grammar and appear to constitute a part of grammar that is highly permeable (e.g. Brody, 1987; 1995; Dajko & Carmichael, 2014). Previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations widely focus on a recipient language in which discourse-pragmatic features from a donor language are inserted or calqued (e.g. Lipski, 2005; Salmons, 1990; Torres, 2002), without considering the linguistic and social conditioning of these features in the donor language, which is crucial to assess the permeability of discourse.

This dissertation assesses the permeability of discourse in the speech of eighteen Spanish-English bilinguals from Southern Arizona. In doing so, it analyzes the linguistic and social conditioning of three discourse-pragmatic features that are prominent in both languages. These discourse-pragmatic features include the discourse marker like in English and its equivalents como, como que, and like in Spanish, quotatives, and general extenders. It was expected that these discourse-pragmatic features would be highly permeable in the speech of these bilinguals; however, contact with English did not radically influence the use of any of these discourse-pragmatic features in the Spanish of
these bilinguals. This dissertation contributes to our understanding of the permeability of discourse in bilingual speech. In addition, it explores how this knowledge can be applied in pedagogical contexts.
1.1. Introduction

Discourse-pragmatic features can include discourse markers, interjections, greetings, expletives, vocatives, general extenders, tags, quotatives, focus markers, intonation, and paralinguistic features such as gesture (Anderson, 2014, p. 23). Discourse-pragmatic features, such as those bolded in the excerpts below, are defined by Pichler (2013) as follows:

Discourse-pragmatic features constitute a formally heterogeneous category of syntactically optional elements which make little or no contribution to the truth-conditional meaning of their host units, and—depending on their scope, linguistic context, as well as sequential, situational, and cognitive context—perform one or more of the following macro-functions: to express speaker stance; to guide utterance interpretation; and to structure discourse. (p. 4)

Consider the following narrative in English by a young male Spanish-English bilingual.

(1) 5B2: He was dancing with a girl and they were both drunk and the girl was my friend that made the party. And I got mad ‘cause he was like taking advantage of her, he was touching her and everything. And I got more mad that he did the, he like spilled the drink. And then he was doing that.

5B1: Yeah.
5B2: So I remember I got mad and like I, I’m not a fighter, and I pushed him. Like instantly I just pushed him,

5B1: ((gasp))

5B2: Yeah, I got mad, I don’t know what happened but I got mad and I pushed him and then it took him a few like seconds to like realize that I pushed him,

5B1: Yeah.

5B2: And then he comes up to me, like, “Did you just push me?” And like I, and I was mad, I was like, “Yeah, I pushed you, you’re dancing like a dumbass. Like move over, like get to the dance floor and not on the, on the edge.” And with that, like he got really mad and he got my friend to the side, and he was like right in my face. And I got mad.

5B1: He tried to fight you?

5B2: Yeah, he wanted to fight me. And I got mad, too so I got in his face, too.

5B1: ((gasp))

5B2: And then out of nowhere like I, I feel like people pulling me. And then I got kicked out of the house. Instead of him (5BE).

Also consider the following narrative in Spanish by the same young male Spanish-English bilingual.

(2) 5B2: Creo que yo fui el estudiante malo con una maestra.

5B1: ¿Sí?
5B2: Sí, en la prepa, haz de cuenta que en la prepa era una maestra nueva y venía de XXX y era de inglés y la tenía para mis últimas clases y era bien frustrante la mujer porque nos trataba como niños chiquitos, así como: “Ay mi niño, no se les olvide las gomitas” así como, ay, no sé, bien frustrante.

5B1: Sí.

5B2: Y luego de que-

5B1: Asco.

5B2: Ajá, te lo juro así y luego, no sé, si hacías algo o te portabas mal en la clase, te comportabas mal en clase, o lo que sea, al ratito te dejaba como una notita: “Sé que estás en un mal día. Vamos a hablar sobre tus problemas y yo voy a estar aquí para apoyarte.” Así como dices: “Okay pues ya” (5BS).

5B2: I think that I was the bad student with a teacher.

5B1: Really?

5B2: Yes, in high school, realize that in high school there was a new teacher and she came from XXX and she was an English teacher and I had her for my last classes and she was really frustrating because she treated us like little kids, like “Ay my child, don’t forget the erasers” like, ay, I don’t know, really frustrating.

5B1: Yes

5B2: And then

5B1: Gross
5B2: Uh-huh. I swear, like that and then, I don’t know, if you did something or misbehaved in the class, you were being bad in the class, or whatever, later she would leave you like a little note: “I know you are having a bad day. We are going to talk about your problems and I am going to be here to support you.” Until you say: “Okay, enough already” (5BS).

Pichler (2010) argues that discourse-pragmatic features have often been dismissed from linguistic investigation by being “marginalized as overt manifestations of verbal dysfluencies and inarticulateness, meaningless verbal fillers and superfluous hesitation markers” (p. 582). It may be surprising that these elements that are so highly frequent in discourse have been ignored. Discourse-pragmatic features, without question, contribute to and should be considered a part of linguistic competence. When confronted with the daunting task of exhaustively analyzing discourse-pragmatic features, however, perhaps ignorance is bliss.

This dissertation analyzes the use of discourse markers, quotatives, and general extenders produced in Spanish and English discourse by eighteen Spanish-English bilinguals from Southern Arizona. In doing so, it strives to understand the linguistic and social conditioning of these discourse-pragmatic features in both languages that underlie the linguistic competence of these bilinguals. This chapter begins with a literature review of discourse-pragmatic features, their grammaticalization, and the relevant extralinguistic factors that influence their use. Next, previous studies of the use of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations will be reviewed. Finally, the research questions, methods of data collection, information about the participants, and methods of data analysis of the
present study will be presented. The following section offers a brief history of discourse-pragmatic features.

1.2. A Brief History of Discourse-Pragmatic Features

Discourse markers, a component of what has come to be known as discourse-pragmatic features, have been analyzed under two primary theoretical frameworks: a sociolinguistics framework (Schiffrin, 1987) and a pragmatics framework (Fraser, 1990, 1999). These theoretical frameworks differ in their scopes of analysis of discourse markers, their definitions of discourse markers, and their proposed origins of discourse markers.

1.2.1 A Sociolinguistics Framework

Schiffrin (1987) serves as the impetus of the analysis of discourse markers from a sociolinguistics framework. Her analysis of discourse markers was inspired by Gumperz (1982), who views discourse as social interaction, and Labov (1972), who analyzes patterns of social interaction. Consequently, the scope of analysis of discourse markers under a sociolinguistics framework is not only textual, that is, how discourse markers refer to the text itself, but also interpersonal, that is, how discourse markers refer to the social interaction among participants (Maschler, 2009).

Schiffrin (1987) defines discourse markers as “sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk” (p. 31). Brinton (1996) adds that discourse markers are a feature of oral discourse rather than written discourse, they appear with high frequency, they are optional rather than obligatory features, they occur clause initially outside
syntactic structure or loosely attached to it, they are phonologically reduced, they form a separate intonation tone group, and they are multifunctional (pp. 33-34). According to Fuller (2001), discourse markers “are neither a semantic nor a syntactic phenomenon, they do not change the truth condition of a sentence, nor do they participate in the syntactic frame” (p. 353).

Under a sociolinguistics framework, discourse markers are believed to originate from lexical equivalents through a process of grammaticalization described by Traugott (1995). According to Traugott (1995), discourse markers develop along an adverbial cline in which clause internal adverbials acquire new lexical functions at the sentence level, followed by discourse functions at the discourse level (clause internal adverbial $>$ sentence adverbial $>$ discourse particle) (p. 1). Traugott (1995) notes that contrary to other grammaticalization processes, discourse markers acquire increased syntactic freedom and scope (p. 1). Nevertheless, discourse markers illustrate other characteristics of grammaticalization including decategorialization, bonding within the phrase, phonological reduction, generalization of meaning, increase in pragmatic function, and subjectification (pp. 13-14). Since discourse markers originate from lexical equivalents, their analysis under a sociolinguistics framework requires a criterion to distinguish them from their lexical equivalents. Fuller (2003), also cited in Torres and Potowski (2008), observes that if discourse markers are removed from an utterance, both the semantic meaning and the grammaticality of the utterance are retained (p. 186).
1.2.2 A Pragmatics Framework

Fraser (1990, 1999) spearheads the study of discourse markers from a pragmatics perspective. Whereas Schiffrin (1987) views discourse as social interaction and is interested in the patterns of social interaction, Fraser (1990, 1999) is mainly interested in how discourse markers refer to the text itself. He limits the scope of his analysis of discourse markers to the relationship between two utterances.

Fraser (1990) defines discourse markers as “a type of commentary pragmatic marker signaling a sequential discourse relationship” (p. 392). This definition appears very similar to Schiffrin (1987), but its application is quite different because of the scope of the analysis of two utterances. For example, you know is considered a discourse marker under a sociolinguistics framework because it refers to the interaction among participants, but it is not considered a discourse marker under a pragmatics framework because it does not impose a sequential relationship between two utterances.

According to Fraser (1999), discourse markers “do not constitute a separate syntactic category” but originate from conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional phrases, and a few idioms (p. 943). For this reason, they have a “specific, core meaning” (p. 945). However, Fraser (1999) observes that the meaning of discourse markers is “procedural” rather than “conceptual” (p. 944). Instead of specifying the semantic features of an expression, discourse markers mark the relationship between the segment that they introduce, relative to the prior segment (p. 944).
1.2.3 Discourse-Pragmatic Features

A lack of uniformity has hampered comparative analysis in previous studies of discourse markers (Blakemore, 2002; Schourup, 1999; among others). Examine the stark differences in the following lists of discourse markers from Schiffrin (1987) and Fraser (1990), cited by Blakemore (2002, p. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Schiffrin (1987)</th>
<th>From Fraser (1990)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oh, well, but, and, or, so, because, now, then, I mean, y’know, see, look, listen, here, there, why, gosh, boy, this is the point, what I mean is, anyway, whatever</td>
<td>consequently, also, above all, again, anyway, alright, alternatively, besides, conversely, in other words, in any event, meanwhile, more precisely, nevertheless, next, otherwise, similarly, or, and, equally, finally, in that case, in the meantime, incidentally, OK, listen, look, on the one hand, that said, to conclude, to return to my point, while I have you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blakemore (2002, p. 1)

Some of these discrepancies can be explained by the differences between the sociolinguistics and pragmatics theoretical frameworks of analyzing discourse markers. Nevertheless, scholars in discourse-pragmatic variation have begun to address this lack of uniformity.

There is currently a shift in research from a limited scope of discourse markers (however they are defined) to a broader scope of discourse-pragmatic features, defined in the introduction of this chapter. Pichler (2014) argues that expanding the scope of analysis from discourse markers to discourse pragmatic features accounts for “the potential for discourse-pragmatic features to have variable scope and to perform multiple
pragmatic and/or procedural functions, sometimes simultaneously” (p. 5). Expanding the
definition of discourse markers instead of making it more precise may seem
counterproductive to addressing a lack of uniformity; however, it is absolutely necessary
to account for the multiple and overlapping functions that discourse-pragmatic features

Discourse-pragmatic features have been identified in several, unrelated languages
including American Sign Language (Hoza, 2011), Chinese (Yap, Yang & Wong, 2014),
Finnish (Hakulinen & Sepannen, 1992; Peterson & Vaattovaara, 2014), French (Degand,
2014; Hansen, 1997), Hebrew (Maschler, 2009), Italian (Bazzanella, 1990; Ghezzi &
Molinelli, 2014; Tomaselli & Gatt, 2015), Japanese (Ogi, 2014; Onodera, 2014), Korean
(Park, 1998; Sohn & Kim, 2014), Portuguese (Silva & Macedo, 1992), Tojolabal Mayan
(Brody, 1989), Sinhala (Perera & Strauss, 2015), and Spanish (Schwenter, 1996; Travis,
2005) among many others. These studies demonstrate that research on discourse-
pragmatic features is flourishing, creating avenues for cross-linguistic comparisons.

1.3. Grammaticalization of Discourse-Pragmatic Features

Discourse-pragmatic features are hallmarks of grammaticalization because they
exemplify the decategorialization of grammatical items to fulfill pragmatic functions
as “the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic
contexts to serve grammatical functions or grammatical items develop new grammatical
functions” (p. 1). Brinton (2006) observes that if grammatical function is seen as
encompassing pragmatic functions of discourse markers, then they can be seen as having undergone a process of grammaticalization (p. 307).

Traugott (1982) first discusses the grammaticalization of the “markers of turn-taking” *well* and *right*, and proposes that lexical items acquire new grammatical functions followed by an expressive function, with meaning shifting from less personal to more personal (p. 251, 253, 257). Traugott (1995) explores the grammaticalization of *indeed*, *in fact* and *besides*, and proposes that they develop along an adverbial cline in which clause internal adverbials acquire new lexical functions at the sentence level, followed by discourse functions at the discourse level (clause internal adverbial > sentence adverbial > discourse particle) (p. 1). Traugott (1995) notes that contrary to other grammaticalization processes, these discourse markers acquire increased syntactic freedom and scope (p. 1). Nevertheless, they illustrate other characteristics of grammaticalization including the decategorialization of lexical items, bonding within the phrase, phonological reduction, generalization of meaning, increase in pragmatic function, and subjectification (pp. 13-14).

Brinton (2006) reconceptualizes Traugott’s (1995) notion of an adverbial cline as a change in syntactic scope, from phrase, to clause, to discourse. She presents three “pathways” for the development of what she calls “pragmatic markers.” The first pathway “adverb/preposition > conjunction > pragmatic marker” explains the development of *like*, *so*, and *now* in English. The second pathway “predicate adverb > sentence adverb > pragmatic marker” illustrates the trajectory of *indeed*, *actually*, and *in fact*, among others. The third pathway of “matrix clause > matrix clause/parenthetical disjunct > pragmatic marker” demonstrates the development of *I think* and *I say*. Brinton
(2006) also presents additional pathways and notes that intermediary steps can be skipped. What unites these pathways is that they are unidirectional in their development beginning with scope within the proposition, followed by scope over the proposition, followed by scope over discourse (Brinton, 2006).

1.4. Extralinguistic Factors in the Use of Discourse-Pragmatic Features

Discourse-pragmatic features have been analyzed across a variety of contexts including sociolinguistic interviews (D’Arcy, 2005), informal conversations (Maschler, 1994, 1997, 2009; Sánchez Muñoz, 2007), student presentations (Sánchez-Muñoz, 2007), teacher talk (de Fina, 1997), and oral narratives (Flores-Ferrán, 2014; Norrick 2001; Segal, Duchan & Scott, 1991; Torres, 2002). Sánchez-Muñoz (2007) argues that the use of *como* as a discourse marker in Spanish is more frequent in informal contexts suggesting that discourse-pragmatic features may be subject to stylistic shifting. Norrick (2001) argues that discourse markers are more frequent in oral narratives because of the sequential nature of storytelling.

Regarding social factors in the use of discourse-pragmatic features, many studies have found age and sex to be relevant. Several studies have concluded that younger speakers use discourse-pragmatic features more frequently than older speakers (Andersen, 2001; D’Arcy, 2005; Pichler, 2013). Regarding sex, Brinton (1996) has argued, admittedly controversially, that women use discourse markers more than men (echoing Lakoff, 1975). Although some studies have found that women use discourse-pragmatic features more than men (Andersen, 2001; Tagliamonte, 2005), some studies have found that men use discourse-pragmatic features than women (Dailey-O’Cain,
and others have not found sex to be significant (Cheshire, 2007; Norrby & Winter, 2002; Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010). In contact situations, language dominance has been found to be significant. Sankoff et al. (1997) found that the frequency of discourse markers in the Quebec French-English bilinguals’ second language of French was correlated with fluency in French.

1.5. Discourse-Pragmatic Features in Contact Situations

In addition to Sankoff et al. (1997), discourse-pragmatic features have been previously studied in contact situations by many others. Before Brody (1987), who documented borrowed discourse markers from Spanish in several Mayan languages, discourse-pragmatic features rarely appeared on the radar of borrowed items. Although discourse-pragmatic features fulfill the criterion for borrowing of structural equivalency (Bickerton, 1981), they are functional items, which goes against Moravcsik (1978) who argue that non-lexical items are rarely borrowed.

The borrowing of discourse-pragmatic features appears to lend support to the “anything goes” hypothesis set forth by Thomason and Kaufman (1998). These authors propose that the degree of contact between languages determines their convergence. Casual contact leads to the borrowing of lexical items. More intense contact leads to the borrowing of non-lexical items. Cases of extreme contact lead to syntactic, morphological, and phonological changes (Thomason & Kaufman, 1998, pp. 74-75).

Under the framework of the Matrix-Language Frame Model (Myers-Scotton, 1993), Myers-Scotton and Jake (1995) reconceptualize the binary of lexical versus non-lexical into a new binary of content morphemes, which receive or assign thematic roles,
and other morphemes that do not. The category of content morphemes includes descriptive adjectives and nouns that receive thematic roles as well as verbs, predicate adjectives, and some prepositions that assign thematic roles. Similar to the role of lexical items in the previous binary, content morphemes are highly permeable in contact situations whereas other morphemes are not. Myers-Scotton and Jake (1995) argue that discourse markers are highly permeable because they assign thematic roles at the discourse level, although they do not explain how they do so. According to Myers-Scotton & Jake (1995), discourse markers are content morphemes at the discourse level (p. 984; also cited in Goss & Salmons, 2000, p. 482).

1.5.1 Forms and Functions of Discourse-Pragmatic Features in Contact Situations

Several studies have documented the use of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations. Some of these studies have focused on the forms of discourse-pragmatic features in contact and others on their functions.

1.5.1.1 Forms of Discourse-Pragmatic Features in Contact

A central question that has guided studies of forms of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations is whether the use of the form of a discourse-pragmatic feature from one language in the discourse of another language exemplifies code-switching, borrowing, or both. Myers-Scotton (1993) cited in Torres (2002) argues that frequency of use is the most important factor in establishing whether a single word exemplifies code-switching or borrowing. While borrowings are frequently used, code-switches may only be used once. Poplack and Sankoff (1984), also cited in Torres (2002), argue that it is not
only frequency of use that can determine if a single word exemplifies code-switching or borrowing, but also several other factors including native language displacement, morphophonemic and syntactic integration, and community acceptability.

Regarding evidence that bilingual discourse-pragmatic features exemplify code-switching, Poplack (1980) coins the term “emblematic” code-switching to refer to the use of English extra-sentential tags in Spanish among Puerto Rican Spanish-English bilinguals living in New York City. “Emblematic” code-switching is a discourse strategy used by Spanish-dominant speakers to demonstrate that they can code-switch (p. 614), and it occurs extra-sententially because extra-sentential code-switching requires less proficiency in English than intra-sentential code-switching (p. 605).

Similarly, Lipski (2005) suggests that the use of so in Spanish discourse may exemplify “involuntary” code-switching (p. 12). He argues that Spanish-English bilinguals (and also second language learners of Spanish) insert English so in Spanish discourse because they spend the majority of the day speaking in English. Lipski (2005) proposes that the insertion of so in Spanish discourse may be automatic and against the preference of Spanish-English bilinguals. It signals “a metalevel in which discourse is framed in terms of English” (p. 12).

Regarding evidence that bilingual discourse-pragmatic features exemplify borrowing, many studies have found that bilingual discourse markers appear with high frequency, which would attest to their classification as borrowings (Brody, 1987; Flores-Ferrán, 2014; Salmons, 1990; Torres, 2002; Torres & Potowski, 2008). Moreover, some studies have found native language displacement of discourse markers in various degrees, especially among third generation speakers (Salmons, 1990; Torres, 2002; Torres &
Several studies have argued that bilingual discourse-pragmatic features should be viewed as both code-switching and borrowings, entering a recipient through code-switching and later becoming established borrowings (Goss & Salmons, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Torres, 2002). Torres (2002) argues that code-switching and borrowing should be viewed as a continuum rather than entirely different processes (p. 78). Among Spanish-English bilinguals in New York, Torres (2002) concludes that Spanish-dominant speakers had a restricted use of English discourse markers, but English-dominant speakers have still maintained the Spanish discourse marker system to some degree. The English discourse markers so and you know were characterized as borrowings because they occur with high frequency and are usually preceded and followed by Spanish discourse, while the use of and was not considered a borrowing because it only appeared in code-switches. Torres and Potowski (2008) corroborate that so is a borrowing among Spanish-English bilinguals in Chicago. Weaker Spanish proficiency was strongly correlated with an increase of so at the expense of entonces. Aaron (2004) concludes that both so and entonces are used to fulfill the same discourse functions at relatively the same frequency without specialization among Spanish-English bilinguals in New Mexico. Since so occurs with code-switching more frequently than entonces, Aaron (2004) argues that so may function as a trigger for code-switching.

### 1.5.1.2 Functions of Discourse-Pragmatic Features in Contact

Andersen (2014) shifts the focus from form to function regarding the use of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations. He uses the term “pragmatic borrowing” to refer
to “the incorporation of pragmatic and discourse features of a source language into a recipient language” (p. 17). When discourse-pragmatic features are in contact, it is not only their forms that can be transferred, but also their functions. Pragmatic borrowing can occur in bilingual communities such as use of Dutch interjections *ja* (*yes*), *nee* (*no*) and *zeg* (*hey*) and the expletive *godverdomme* (*goddamn*) in French and the French discourse marker *d’accord* (*okay*) in Dutch (Treffers-Daller, 1994, cited in Andersen, 2014, p. 23). However, Andersen (2014) observes that pragmatic borrowing can also occur in monolingual communities as a result of the effect of English as a global language. Examples include the use of the politeness marker *pliis* in Finnish (Peterson & Vaattovaara, 2014) and the expletive *fuck* and its variations in Norwegian (Andersen, 2014). There can also be the transfer of functions without form as documented by several studies of equivalents of *like* in English in other languages (Hlavic, 2006; Kern, 2014; Sankoff et al., 1997) and the transfer of the discourse functions of –*mi* in Quechua to *pues* in Spanish among Spanish-Quechua bilinguals in Peru (Zavala, 2001).

### 1.5.2 Motivations of Transfer in Contact Situations

Many studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact have gone further to examine the motivations of the transfer of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations. These motivations include lessening the cognitive load, filling a gap, and marking or strengthening discourse boundaries.
1.5.2.1 Lessening the Cognitive Load

Some studies have begun to question whether the use of bilingual discourse-pragmatic features is more cognitively motivated than socially motivated. In addition to textual and interpersonal realms of discourse markers, Maschler (2009) argues that there is also a cognitive realm in which discourse markers can refer to cognitive processes taking place in the mind during verbalization. Matras (2000) argues that the cognitive motivation of using bilingual discourse markers is so strong that it can “override the social and communicative constraints on the discourse” which may explain unintentional choices or slips (pp. 514-515). This echoes Lipski’s (2005) analysis of so insertion in Spanish.

Matras (1998) proposes a pragmatic detachability hierarchy that predicts the cognitive motivations of the convergence of discourse markers systems in contact situations. According to Matras (1998), the convergence of discourse marker systems in contact situations “is motivated by the need to reduce overload in the mental monitoring of hearer-sided language-processing activities in bilingual communicative interaction” (p. 291). Matras (1998) argues that preference is given to the pragmatically dominant language in contact situations. “Pragmatically dominant” refers to the “role of a given language in regulating mental processing activities” (p. 286). When two discourse marker systems converge, the pragmatically dominant language lends its discourse markers to the other language (p. 286).

Matras (1998) proposes three scales of pragmatic detachability that predict which discourse markers that are most likely to be borrowed in contact situations. A semantic scale dictates that discourse markers that are used to indicate contrast, restriction, or change are more likely to be borrowed than discourse markers that are used to indicate
addition, elaboration, and continuation. A category-sensitive scale dictates that discourse markers that are less lexical/deictic are more likely to be borrowed than discourse markers that are more lexical/deictic. Lastly, an operational scale dictates that discourse markers that are more turn-related are more likely to be borrowed than discourse markers that are more content related.

The model of pragmatic detachability proposed by Matras (1998) has been supported and refuted. Fuller (2001) found evidence to support the model pragmatic detachability with the use of English discourse markers in German discourse among German-English bilinguals in Pennsylvania. According to Fuller (2001), the most frequently used English discourse markers were non-lexical and turn-related, satisfying the predictions of the model. On the other hand, Boas and Weilbacher (2007) found that English discourse markers low on the pragmatic detachability scale were used with high frequency in German discourse among German-English bilinguals in Texas, questioning the universality of this model. The English discourse marker you know and its German counterpart were found to fulfill the same discourse functions. Kern and Lozano (2016) also question the pragmatic detachability hierarchy in their analysis of so, you know, and like in Arizona Spanish. The scale perhaps predicts the borrowing of you know, which is primarily used for addition, elaboration, and continuation and is turn related, but does not predict the borrowing of so or the absence of like.

1.5.2.2 Filling a Gap
Another common motivation for the convergence of discourse-pragmatic features outlined in previous studies is the concept of filling a gap (Hill & Hill, 1986; Hlavic,
Hlavac (2006) proposes that the discourse marker that fulfills the most functions is selected in the process of convergence. Hlavac (2006) argues that Croatian-English bilinguals when faced with the choice of using a discourse marker in Croatian or its equivalent in English choose the discourse marker that fulfills the most functions. Croatian-English bilinguals choose *yeah* and *so* in English because they perform more functions than their Croatian counterparts. They use *no* and *you know* in English at the same frequency as their Croatian counterparts because they perform the same amount of functions. Lastly, they use *kao* in Croatian more frequently than its English counterpart *like* because it can fulfill more functions. Rather than lessening the cognitive load, Hlavic (2006) finds that English discourse markers occur alongside Croatian discourse markers, and their presence is additive.

**1.5.2.3 Marking or Strengthening Discourse Boundaries**

A third motivation for convergence of discourse-pragmatic features is the marking or strengthening of discourse boundaries (Dajko & Carmichael, 2014; de Rooij, 2000; Maschler 1994, 1997, 2009). Maschler (1994, 1997, 2009) argues that Hebrew-English bilinguals use English discourse markers in Hebrew discourse “to metalanguage” discourse boundaries, that is, to mark Hebrew discourse strategically through English. The choice of English discourse markers instead of their Hebrew counterparts is iconic, fulfilling the same discourse function as the discourse markers themselves. The use of English discourse markers is often accompanied by pauses to preserve maximal contrast.

Similarly, de Rooij (2000) argues that Shaba Swahili-French bilinguals use French discourse markers instead of Shaba Swahili discourse markers to strengthen
discourse in Shaba Swahili. French discourse markers stand out more and are more salient than their Shaba Swahili counterparts in Shaba Swahili discourse. In support of this hypothesis, de Rooij (2000) observes that French discourse markers are often accompanied by pauses and prosodic cues to increase their saliency even more. Dajko and Carmichael (2014) also found that the use of but in Louisiana French was accompanied by a pause more than its French equivalent mais.

1.6. The Present Study

Taking into account the previous review of discourse-pragmatic features, their diachronic development through grammaticalization, and their potential to assess contact-induced linguistic change, the present study builds on these previous studies to explore the permeability of discourse in the speech of eighteen Spanish-English bilinguals from Southern Arizona. Previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations have widely ignored the donor language. In fact, of the studies on discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations previously reviewed only Sankoff et al. (1997) and Levey et al. (2013) has not analyzed the donor language. Sankoff et al. (1997) analyzed the frequency of discourse markers in English in addition to the linguistic conditioning of discourse markers in Quebec French among the same bilinguals from Montreal. The authors concluded that discourse markers were significantly more frequent in English than French for the majority of bilinguals. Moreover, the frequency of discourse markers in French was correlated with fluency in French. Levey et al. (2013) found that the innovative use of être comme in Canadian French was conditioned differently than its equivalent be like in English, leading the investigators to conclude that contact with
English did not play a decisive role in the use of \textit{être comme}. Levey et al. (2013) analyzed two different corpora collected during the same time frame, but composed of different speakers. The novelty of the present study is that it analyzes not only the frequency but the linguistic and social conditioning of the use of discourse-pragmatic features in English and Spanish corpora comprised of data from the same Spanish-English bilinguals, which allows for the permeability of discourse in the speech of the same bilinguals to be assessed. The following sections outline the research questions, methods of data collection, information about the participants, and methods of data analysis.

1.6.1 Research Questions

In order to assess the permeability of discourse in the speech of Spanish-English bilinguals, the following three chapters analyze the linguistic and social conditioning of three different discourse-pragmatic features in English and Spanish. In Chapter 2, the use of \textit{like} and \textit{como} as discourse markers and discourse particles is analyzed. The following research questions will be addressed:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the relative frequencies of the use of \textit{like} in English and \textit{como}, \textit{como que}, and \textit{like} in Spanish as discourse markers and discourse particles?

2. What are the similarities and differences in the linguistic conditioning of \textit{like} in English and \textit{como}, \textit{como que}, and \textit{like} in Spanish? How do they compare in terms of the syntactic positions in which they can appear and their distribution as discourse markers and discourse particles?
3. Are sex and language dominance significant in the relative frequencies and/or
the linguistic conditioning of like in English and como, como que, and like in
Spanish?

In Chapter 3, the use of quotatives is analyzed. The following research questions
will be addressed:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the relative frequencies of
quotatives in English and Spanish?
2. What types of quotatives are used in the English and Spanish quotative
systems and what is their distribution?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the linguistic conditioning of
quotatives in English and Spanish? Are quotatives conditioned by tense,
person, or content of the quote?
4. Are sex and language dominance significant in the relative frequencies of
quotatives, and/or their linguistic conditioning in the English and Spanish
quotative systems?

In Chapter 4, the use of general extenders is analyzed. The following research
questions will be addressed:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the relative frequencies of general
extenders in English and Spanish?
2. What are the types of general extenders used in English and Spanish and what
is the distribution of adjunctive and disjunctive general extenders in both
languages?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the linguistic conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish? What is the distribution of referential and non-referential functions of general extenders in both languages? What are the formal characteristics of referential general extenders?

4. Are sex and language dominance significant in the relative frequencies of general extenders and/or their linguistic conditioning in English and Spanish?

Together, these three studies contribute to our knowledge of the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals by shedding light on the linguistic and social conditioning of three discourse-pragmatic features in both English and Spanish among the same Spanish-English bilinguals.

1.6.2 Methods of Data Collection

The majority of previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features have analyzed data collected from sociolinguistic interviews or similar methods in which an investigator is present during the interaction (D’Arcy, 2005; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004, 2007; Torres, 2002). When an investigator is present, participants have been shown to accommodate their language use (Childs, 2016; Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1993). In order to eliminate the potential for linguistic accommodation, conversations between friends who know each other can be recorded without the presence of the investigator (Macaulay, 2002). This method of data collection has been shown to elicit an informal register with a higher frequency of discourse-pragmatic features than more formal interviews (Sánchez Muñoz, 2007). Nevertheless, the observer’s paradox is still in play.
because there are recording devices present during the interaction, and participants are aware that they are being recorded.

In the present study, pairs of Spanish-English bilingual friends from Southern Arizona were audio and video recorded while conversing with each other for one hour without the presence of the investigator on two occasions: one occasion in Spanish and the other in English. For each recording, the investigator prepared a quiet room on a university campus with a table and two chairs sitting across from each other. Two video cameras were set up approximately three feet from where participants were sitting to provide a frontal view of one participant and a profile view of the other. A high-quality microphone (AKG P170 Condenser Microphone) and recorder (Zoom H5 Handy Recorder) were also placed nearby.

The participants were recruited from upper-division undergraduate courses at large public university in the U.S. Southwest. In order to participate, participants needed to be Spanish-English bilinguals, between 18 and 24 years old, have been born and raised in Southern Arizona, and have a friend with the same profile. When recruiting participants, the investigator explained that the purpose of the project was to analyze talk among friends. He also explained the procedure of the study. Participants were offered extra credit in their class(es) for their participation.

When each pair of Spanish-English bilingual friends arrived for the first recording, the investigator explained once again the purpose and procedure of the project. He provided participants with IRB consent forms to read and sign. He then provided participants a Demographic Information Form (Figure 1.1) adapted from Carvalho (2012-), and a Bilingual Language Profile (Figure 1.2), adapted from Birdsong et. al. (2006) by
Carvalho (2012-) to complete.

**Figure 1.1: Demographic Information Form (Carvalho, 2012-)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker’s information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place where s/he was raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last grade level completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where education took place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Tucson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous neighborhood(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired profession (students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession in birth country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household yearly income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s educational level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s educational level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s birth place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s birth place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages other than English and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (self)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenotype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close family in Mexico (or anywhere else)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of visits to Mexico (often, occasional, rare, none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors from Mexico (often, occasional, rare, none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married? (L used with spouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse’s ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse’s L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L used with children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.2: Bilingual Language Profile (Birdsong et al., 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Language History</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At what age did you begin to learn these languages?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At what age did you feel comfortable using each of these languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many years of classes have you taken in each language (from grade school to the university level)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many years have you spent in a country or region in which each language is spoken?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How many years have you spent in a family in which each language is spoken?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How many years have you spent in a work or school environment in which each language is spoken?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Language Use</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. In an average week, what percentage do you use each language with friends?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In an average week, what percentage do you use each language with family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In an average week, what percentage do you use each language at school or work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How often do you talk to yourself in each language?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How often do you use each language when counting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Language Proficiency</th>
<th>(0=not very well 6=very well)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. a. How well do you speak Spanish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How well do you speak English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. a. How well do you understand Spanish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How well do you understand English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. a. How well can you read in Spanish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. How well can you read in English?

15. a. How well can you write in Spanish?

b. How well can you write in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Language Attitudes</th>
<th>0=I don’t agree 6=I agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. a. I feel like myself when speaking Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I feel like myself when speaking English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. a. I identify with Spanish-speaking/Latino culture.

b. I identify with English-speaking/Anglo culture.

18. a. It is important to me to use or eventually use Spanish like a native speaker.

b. It is important to me to use or eventually use English like a native speaker.

19. a. I want others to think that I am a native speaker of Spanish.

b. I want others to think that I am a native speaker of English.

After the participants completed the forms, the investigator provided them with conversation questions in English or Spanish. Each question was typed on a slip of paper and compiled in an envelope. Participants were instructed that the conversation questions were optional. They could select a question from the envelope if they wanted or needed a topic to sustain their conversation and could skip questions if they did not want to talk about the topic. The conversation questions in both English and Spanish are in Figure 1.3.

**Figure 1.3: Conversation Questions in English and Spanish**

1. What has been your favorite vacation?
2. How did you meet your best friend?
3. What class have you most enjoyed taking?
4. Have you had a really embarrassing moment?
5. Have you ever felt peer pressure or observed someone else that was pressured to do something by peers?
6. Have you ever had a relationship that ended badly?
7. Have you ever been in a situation in which you felt discriminated against?
8. What was a difficult decision that you had to make?
9. What has been your favorite party that you have attended?
10. Have you ever made a mistake and learned from it?
11. What was the most memorable sports moment that you witnessed or in which you participated?
12. What was the moment in which you felt independent for the first time?
13. What was an obstacle in your life that you had to overcome?
14. What has been the most important event in your life?

1. ¿Alguna vez tuviste un sueño que te asustara mucho? ¿Los sueños significan algo?
   Have you ever had a dream that scared you a lot? Do dreams have meaning?
2. ¿Alguna vez has estado en una situación en la que estuvieras en grave peligro, en la que te dijeras, “ahora mismo me voy a morir”?
   Have you ever been in a situation in which you were in grave danger, in which you said to yourself “I’m going to die”?
3. ¿Cuál fue el momento más feliz de tu vida?
   What was the happiest moment of your life?
4. ¿Alguna vez te pusiste contento/a por algo bueno que te pasó a ti o le pasó a otro?
   Have you ever been happy for something good that happened to you or someone else?
5. ¿Alguna vez tuviste un trabajo muy desagradable o raro?
   Have you ever had an unpleasant or strange job?
6. ¿Alguna vez te echaron la culpa por algo que no hiciste?
   Have you ever been blamed for something that you did not do?
7. ¿Te acuerdas de una cita que no fuera bien? ¿Qué pasó?
   Do you remember a date that did not go well? What happened?
8. ¿Tuviste algún maestro o alguna maestra que fuera muy buena?
   Have you had a teacher that was really good?
9. ¿Tuviste alguna clase que fuera muy difícil?
   Have you had a class that was really difficult?
10. ¿Qué es lo peor que viste que un maestro hizo a un estudiante? ¿O un estudiante a un maestro?
    What is the worst thing that you have seen a teacher do to a student or a student to a teacher?
11. ¿Celebraban la Navidad de niño/niña? ¿Cuál era tu regalo navideño favorito? ¿Por qué?
    Did you celebrate Christmas when you were a child? What was your favorite Christmas gift? Why?
12. ¿Alguna vez pasó algo que no pudieras explicar?
    Has something ever happened that you could not explain?
13. ¿Quién fue la persona más importante en tu vida? ¿Puedes contar más acerca de él/ella?
    Who was the most important person in your life? Can you tell more about him or her?
14. ¿Alguna vez has tenido mucho miedo de algo? ¿Cuándo fue? ¿Qué pasó?
    Have you ever been really afraid of something? When was it? What happened?
After providing participants with the conversation questions, the investigator asked the participants if they had any questions, turned on the microphone and the video cameras, and left the room. He returned one hour later to end the session. One week later, the participants completed the second conversation in the other language. Half of the pairs of participants had their first conversation in English and their second conversation in Spanish, and the other half of the pairs of participants did the reverse. This method of data collection led to the creation of a corpus of a total of eighteen hours of recorded conversations between pairs of Spanish-English bilingual friends, nine hours in each language. The conversations have an informal register demonstrated through overlapping turns, taboo words, and the use of discourse-pragmatic features.

1.6.3 Participants

Nine pairs of Spanish-English bilinguals were included in the study. The participants are equally divided by sex. One pair of participants consisted of two female friends, one pair of participants consisted of two male friends, and the remaining seven pairs of participants were male-female pairs. All of the participants were heritage speakers of Spanish. Although definitions of heritage speakers can be broad and narrow, two characteristics of heritage speakers will be highlighted here. First, all heritage language learners come into the classroom with some degree of personal experience with the heritage language (Draper & Hicks, 2000; Fishman, 2001; Valdés, 2000). Secondly (and consequently), all heritage language learners are bilingual in various degrees. Valdés (2001) eloquently illustrates the bilingual competence of heritage learners on a dynamic continuum that changes over time. To assess language dominance in this study, a
A dominance score was calculated for each participant using the Bilingual Language Profile (Figure 1.2) adapted from Birdsong et al. (2006) by Carvalho (2012-). These scores have a range of -218 to +218, with a score near zero corresponding to balanced bilingualism, negative values indicating Spanish dominance, and positive values indicating English dominance. The average dominance score of the all of the participants was 3.20. Male participants had an average dominance score of 5.06 and female participants had an average dominance score of 1.34. The participants’ sex and dominance scores can be found in Table 1.1. The participants’ numbers correspond to pairs.

Table 1.1: Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Dominance Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Bilinguals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B1 F</td>
<td>-60.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B2 F</td>
<td>-27.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2 F</td>
<td>-22.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B1 F</td>
<td>-9.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B2 F</td>
<td>13.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B2 F</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>22.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2 F</td>
<td>33.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B2 F</td>
<td>48.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Female Bilinguals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Bilinguals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B2 M</td>
<td>-26.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B1 M</td>
<td>-21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B1 M</td>
<td>-19.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B2 M</td>
<td>-9.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1 M</td>
<td>-6.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B1 M</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B1 M</td>
<td>21.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B1 M</td>
<td>47.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B1 M</td>
<td>49.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Male Bilinguals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6.4 Methods of Data Analysis

Picher (2010) writes: “The development of a reliable and uniform model of analysis is paramount in order to advance our understanding of discourse variation and change.” (p. 582) Unlike morphosyntactic and phonological variables, discourse-pragmatic features are optional, they do not occur in a fixed context, and they are multifunctional, often fulfilling different, sometimes overlapping, functions in different contexts (Pichler, 2010, p. 588). These characteristics complicate their analysis, and different methodologies of quantitative analysis have hampered cross-corpora comparability. Discourse-pragmatic features have been analyzed quantitatively either by counting all of the instances of a single form while disregarding function or by counting all of the forms that fulfill a single function (Tagliamonte, 2012; Wagner et al., 2015). With the notable exception of D’Arcy (2005), who follows the first approach to analyze the syntactic positioning of *like*, the second approach has been most commonly followed in discourse-pragmatic variation, including studies of quotatives (Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004, 2007), general extenders (Wagner et al., 2015), and tag questions (Pichler, 2013).

Nevertheless, this second approach of counting all of the forms that fulfill a single function presents several issues. First, Picher (2010) proposes it might be “unfeasible” to account for all of the variants of a given function (p. 589). Secondly, Picher argues that function is not a stable category, citing Aijmer (2002), Cheshire (2007) and Overstreet (1999), who conclude that general extenders fulfill non-referential discourse functions in addition to their canonical referential function of extending a set. Grouping all forms of general extenders into a single functional category overlooks the non-referential functions that they fulfill and the other possible variants that fulfill these other functions. Thirdly,
the variants of a given function are not always semantically equivalent (Pichler, 2010, p. 583). Regarding quotatives, Andersen (2001) argues that *be like* is not always interchangeable with *say*, pointing out that *say* is restricted to speech that is verbally uttered while *be like* is not (p. 253). This violates Labov’s (1972) concept of a sociolinguistic variable of two ways of saying the same thing. Lastly, the coding of pragmatic function is subjective (Macaulay, 2002; Wagner et al., 2015).

The frequency of discourse-pragmatic features may be the most important aspect of their variation (Macaulay, 2002), and this presents more issues regarding the quantitative analysis of discourse-pragmatic features. Relative frequencies of discourse-pragmatic features according to word count per 1,000 or 10,000 words are highly dependent on the methods of data collection (sociolinguistic interviews, conversations etc.) which may favor certain discourse-pragmatic features over others (Macaulay, 2002), as well as how data is transcribed such as including hesitations and false starts or not including them (Pichler, 2010). The analysis of frequency also does not take into account the contexts in which discourse-pragmatic features appear or do not appear (Pichler, 2010), violating Labov’s (1972) principle of accountability. D’Arcy (2005) takes into account Labov’s (1972) principle of accountability by identifying the contexts in which *like* appears and assessing when it appears and when it does not, but she does not take into account function.

It is only through multiple analyses, both qualitative and quantitative, that a more complete picture of the use of discourse-pragmatic features can be provided. A qualitative analysis must be carried out to identify all of the forms of discourse-pragmatic features that fulfill common discourse functions and to circumscribe their variable
context according to clear and objective criteria. Following the qualitative analysis, a quantitative analysis must be carried out to identify the patterns in the use of discourse-pragmatic features and to assess their linguistic and social conditioning according to linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

In the present study, the eighteen hours of recorded conversations were transcribed by a team of undergraduate and graduate researchers and were checked by the investigator. The word count for each participant was calculated in both languages. Responding to Picher’s (2010) call for the methodology of word counts to be explained in detail, whole word false starts were included in the word count, while non-word false starts were excluded. Planners (hmm, uh, ugh, um, ah), affirmations (uh-huh, ok), and interjections (ooh!, argh!) were included in the word count. Contractions were transcribed as one word including wanna and gonna. The word counts in both languages for each participant are in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2: Word Counts in English and Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Word Count in English</th>
<th>Word Count in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B1 F</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>5234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B2 F</td>
<td>5593</td>
<td>7648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2 F</td>
<td>2699</td>
<td>4072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B1 F</td>
<td>3607</td>
<td>2766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B2 F</td>
<td>7963</td>
<td>4971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B2 F</td>
<td>4417</td>
<td>3904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>3705</td>
<td>3239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2 F</td>
<td>4221</td>
<td>2919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B2 F</td>
<td>6710</td>
<td>2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Bilinguals</td>
<td>40423</td>
<td>37664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B2 M</td>
<td>5955</td>
<td>4780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B1 M</td>
<td>4070</td>
<td>3639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B1 M</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>3761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B2 M</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1 M</td>
<td>4762</td>
<td>4656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B1 M</td>
<td>15B1 M</td>
<td>17B1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3121</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>4537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>2077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the qualitative analysis of the present study, tokens of the discourse markers *like* and *como*, quotatives, and general extenders were identified in the English and Spanish corpora. Each discourse-pragmatic feature was circumscribed according to clear, objective criteria that will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. Each token was coded according to several linguistic and social factors that were selected from previous analyses of these features in contact and non-contact situations. The linguistic factors include the syntactic positioning of *like* and *como*, the tense, grammatical person, and content of the quote of quotatives, and the type and length of general extenders that fulfill referential functions. The social factors included for each discourse-pragmatic feature were sex and language dominance.

For the quantitative analysis, 3389 tokens of *like* and *como*, 1304 tokens of quotatives, and 325 tokens of general extenders were submitted to R to explore their relative frequencies and their linguistic and social conditioning within English and Spanish and across both languages. The linear and logistic mixed-effects models were carried out with random intercepts for each participant to take into account cross-individual variation, which has been shown to be relevant in several previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features (e.g., Carvalho & Kern, 2015; Sankoff et al., 1997). Following Poplack and Levey (2010, p. 398), a candidate for a truly contact-induced linguistic change must be absent or conditioned differently in non-contact varieties. This
dissertation draws on Tagliamonte’s (2003) comparative sociolinguistic approach to compare the linguistic and social conditioning of these discourse-pragmatic features not only in contact and non-contact varieties, but also between both languages of the same bilinguals. It is only through these qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis that the role of English contact in the development of discourse-pragmatic features in Spanish can be assessed.

1.7. Structure of the Dissertation

The following three chapters analyze the use of the discourse markers como and like (Chapter 2), quotatives (Chapter 3), and general extenders (Chapter 4) in English and Spanish discourse among the bilingual participants. In each chapter, the grammaticalization of these discourse-pragmatic features is addressed, their variable context is circumscribed, and their linguistic and social conditioning within and between English and Spanish is assessed. In Chapter 5, the contributions of this dissertation to our knowledge of the permeability of discourse in bilingual speech are presented and the pedagogical applications of this research are explored.
CHAPTER 2: LIKE AND COMO

2.1. Introduction

Thirty years ago, an innovative use of *like* as a discourse marker was analyzed in American English (Schourup, 1985; Underhill, 1988). It has now been documented not only in American English, but in other English speaking countries including Canada (D’Arcy, 2005), England (Andersen, 2001; Macaulay, 2001) and Australia (Miller, 2009; Rodríguez Louro, 2013). The use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse marker equivalent to *like* appears to have been a more recent development, found in both Spanish-English bilingual communities (Kern, 2014; Said-Mohand, 2008; Sánchez-Muñoz, 2007), and Spanish monolingual dialects (Jørgensen & Stenström, 2009). Equivalents of *like* as a discourse marker have also been documented in other languages including *comme* (Sankoff et al., 1997) and *genre* in French (Fleischman & Yaguello, 2004), *ke‘ilu* in Hebrew (Maschler, 2009), and *kao* in Croatian (Hlavic, 2006).

As discussed in Chapter 1, discourse markers are defined by Schiffrin (1987) as “sequentially dependent elements that bracket units of talk” (p. 31). Brinton (1996) adds that discourse markers occur with high frequency in oral discourse and are optional rather than obligatory elements. The following examples of the use of *like* (1) and *como* and its equivalent variants (2) as discourse markers occurring clause-externally (*bolded*) and discourse particles occurring clause-internally (*underlined*) were extracted from the present corpus of informal conversations in English and Spanish between pairs of Spanish-English bilingual friends from Southern Arizona.

(1) 7B2: But um, XXX used Mat Lab and he does programs to um, freakin’,

*like* record himself. *Like* on a mic or something. He puts all the data
into like files on Mat Lab and he stores it. And he can do, he does all kinds of stuff like that. And like, like, let’s say for example you’re, you’re an engineer. Obviously we’re both engineers, like, that’s an EC. And you can like, you can have like some kind of censor that’s connected to like, um, some kind of sensor that measures like voltage for example. Um, connect it to your laptop, via like USB or some kind of adapter. Then you can put all the data into Mat Lab, and you can do all kinds of things, like plot it, like, minis, maxis, like cumulative sums.

7B1: I like sums.

7B2: Like, you can do all kinds of stuff (7BE).

8B2: Eres tú grumpy grumpy grumpy grumpy cats

8B1: No, como que estaba cansado y como que me siento que, como que, no, um, no estoy haciendo on purpose, like.

8B2: Se nota

8B1: Es como que ya quiero empezar a hacer más cosas, pero como que, no puedo, como que, no, y mi muffin top está como igual.

8B2: Ay Dios mío

8B1: Y luego se queda, aquí, ((gesto)) como estoy bien flaco ahora pero aquí ((gesto)) estoy medio gordo (8BS).

8B2: You are grumpy grumpy grumpy grumpy cats

8B1: No, like I was tired and like I feel that, like, no, um, I’m not doing it on purpose, like.
8B2: I can tell.

8B1: It’s like, I now want to do more things, but like, I can’t, like, no, and my muffin top is like the same.

8B2: My God.

8B1: And then it stays, here, ((gesture)) like I’m pretty skinny now, but here ((gesture)) I’m a little fat (8BS).

This chapter analyzes the use of *like* in English and the use of *como*, *como que* and *like* in Spanish among bilinguals from Southern Arizona and the similarities and differences in their linguistic and social conditioning within and between languages. It begins by discussing the grammaticalization of *like* and *como*. This is followed by circumscribing their variable contexts according to both form and function in order to pinpoint the exact site within linguistic structure that variation is taking place. Finally, the analysis of the linguistic and social conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que* and *like* in Spanish in the present corpora in English and Spanish comprised of the speech of the same bilinguals is presented and discussed.

2.2. Grammaticalization of *like* and *como*

Discourse markers are believed to originate from lexical equivalents through a process of grammaticalization (Brinton, 2006; Traugott, 1982, 1995). According to Romaine and Lange (1991), the use of *like* in English developed on the pathway of preposition > conjunction > discourse marker (p. 261). This is illustrated in Figure 2.1 with examples from the present corpus.
Figure 2.1: The Grammaticalization of the Discourse Marker *like* in English
(Romaine & Lange, 1991, p. 261)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It looks like a Wal-Mart backpack (8B1).</td>
<td>I feel like I’m in a hotel (15B1)</td>
<td>Like if I get in an accident and something really bad happens to me and I go to the doctor, like they don’t cover those bills (16B2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to decategorialization illustrated in Figure 2.1, D’Arcy (2005) also observes that *like* exhibits other characteristics of grammaticalization including the semantic bleaching of its comparative function (also argued by Meehan, 1991), pragmatic strengthening through its use to fulfill pragmatic functions, and divergence through its multiple uses as a preposition, conjunction, and discourse marker (p. 72). However, D’Arcy (2005) adds that the use of *like* as a discourse particle within the clause does not align with traditional characteristics of grammaticalization because its scope has not broadened, but has narrowed (p. 72). By analyzing the use of *like* as a discourse marker and discourse particle in apparent time, D’Arcy (2005) concludes that the use of *like* as a discourse marker developed before its use as a discourse particle and suggests that the use of *like* as a discourse particle is not an extension of the grammaticalization path previously discussed, but the beginning of a new pathway beginning with the use of *like* as a discourse marker (p. 219). D’Arcy (2005) observes that the use of *like* as a discourse particle develops in the opposite direction as the use of *like* as a discourse marker, incorporating itself back into the syntax of the sentence and narrowing its scope beginning in the determiner phrase and followed by the verbal domain.

Perhaps *como* in Spanish is following the same grammaticalization path proposed for *like* in English (Kern, 2014). Figure 2.2 uses Romaine and Lange (1991)’s pathway of
preposition > conjunction > discourse marker to illustrate a possible parallel grammaticalization path of *como* in Spanish with examples from the present corpus.

**Figure 2.2: The Grammaticalization of the Discourse Marker *como* in Spanish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuenta <em>como</em> la clase y <em>como</em> internship (5B1).</td>
<td>Estaría bien si hablara el portugués <em>como</em> lo hablo el español (12B2).</td>
<td><em>Como</em>, no sé, no sé cómo funciona la verdad (1B1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>It counts as a class and as an internship (5B1).</em></td>
<td><em>It would be good if I spoke portuguese</em> like <em>I speak Spanish</em> (12B2).</td>
<td><em>Like, I don’t know, I don’t know how it works to tell you the truth</em> (1B1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to *like*, *como* can also be used as discourse particle within a clause (Kern, 2014), which does not align with traditional characteristics of grammaticalization because its scope has not broadened, but has narrowed. The present study assesses if D’Arcy’s (2005) hypothesis of a new pathway of grammaticalization for the use of *like* as a discourse particle is consistent with the use of *como* or whether *like* in English is more advanced in this grammaticalization process than *como*. Now that the grammaticalization of *like* and *como* has been discussed, the following section turns to circumscribing the variable contexts of *like* and *como*.

### 2.3. Circumscribing the Variable Contexts of *like* and *como*

Both *like* and *como* can be used to fulfill lexical functions, which must be separated from their use as discourse markers. Following Fuller (2003), a criterion is used to differentiate discourse markers from their lexical equivalents. If discourse markers are removed from an utterance, both grammaticality and the semantic relationship between elements are maintained (Fuller, 2003, p. 186). Examples of *like* in English that were used as a verb
(3), adverb (4), preposition (5), or a conjunction (6) were eliminated because their removal violates grammaticality.

(3) I like this one (3B1).

(4) Well everything always goes like that (1B2).

(5) It looks like a Wal-Mart backpack (8B1).

(6) I feel like I’m in a hotel (15B1)

Likewise, examples of like that fulfilled a lexical function of exemplification (7) as prepositions were eliminated because their removal violates grammaticality.

(7) I really love doing things with my hands like painting (12B1).

Moreover, following D’Arcy (2005) and differing from Andersen (2001), examples of like that fulfilled a lexical function of approximation (8) as adverbs were eliminated because the semantic relationship between elements is no longer intact upon their removal. Any token of like before a quantifiable noun phrase (8a), adjective phrase (8b), or prepositional phrase (8c) was eliminated.

(8) a. She works like four hours per day, or maybe five (3B2).

b. I was like twelve (3B1).

c. So we're gonna leave like at nine (1B1).

As illustrated in (9), examples of like that trailed uncompleted, turn-final utterances were eliminated (9a) but examples of like that occurred on the right periphery of completed utterances (9b) were included in the analysis. The use of like clause finally has been found in British English, particularly in the north (Andersen, 2001)

(9) a. 1B1: Well you could stay and I’ll just like…
1B2: Alright, well, let me see, how, like, how much, how enthusiastic XXX is about it.

b. Because it was like my family was one, and two, it was my friends and a lot of them didn’t speak Spanish you know, like (12B2).

Tokens of the use of *like* in the construction *be like* (10), quotative *like* (11), quotative *it’s like* (12), *like* stacked with other quotatives (13), and *like* within direct quotation (14) were eliminated.

(10) I was *like*, “You went to college?” and she was *like*, “For a semester” (17B2).

(11) I really wanted someone’s opinion, *like* how do I do this?” (3B1).

(12) If your family’s with you *it’s like*, “Wait, why have an apartment, just get a house” (5B2).

(13) Well just ask them *like* “What is the attire that you guys are gonna wear?” (8B2).

(14) She'll be like “Ugh, we can't go on, *like*, dates anymore” (1B1).

The referentially empty collocation *it’s like* (15) discussed by Andersen (2001) was eliminated.

(15) *It’s like*, some of her music’s ok (15B2).

The remaining examples of *like* as a discourse marker outside of a clause (16) or a discourse particle within the clause (17) that upon removal did violate grammaticality or the semantic relationship between elements were included in the study. Any occurrences of *like* that appeared within a clause, but before or after a pause, that is, outside of the scope of the sentence, were classified as discourse markers, as shown in (18).
(16) **Like** when they were about to take her in for surgery, **like** I was born
(15B2).

(17) It was **like** the first cool party we went to (1B2).

(18) I’m too stubborn to **like**, you know, get persuaded too easily (12B2).

The use of *como* in Spanish is similar to the use of *like* in English. According to
the Real Academia Española, *como* can be used as an adverb, preposition, or a
conjunction. Examples of *como* in Spanish that were used as an adverb (19), a preposition
(20), or a conjunction (21) were eliminated because their removal also violates grammaticality.

(19) Y la, la, ¿cómo se llama? La Kim Kardashian (8B1).
    
    And the, the, what is her name? Kim Kardashian (8B1).

(20) Cuenta *como* la clase y *como* internship (5B1).
    
    It counts as a class and as an internship (5B1).

(21) Estaría bien si hablara el portugués *como* lo hablo el español (12B2).
    
    It would be good if I spoke Portuguese **like** I speak Spanish (12B2).

Examples of *como* that fulfilled a lexical function of exemplification (22) as
prepositions were eliminated because their removal also violates grammaticality.

(22) Hay una escuela ahí, no sé cómo se llama la escuela pero sé que está
grande, ya sabes, *como* el field y todo eso (8B1).
    
    There is a school there, I don’t know what the school is called but I know
    that it is big, you know, **like** the field and everything (8B1).

Examples of *como* that fulfilled a lexical function of approximation (23) as
adverbs were eliminated because the semantic relationship between elements is no longer
intact upon their removal. Any token of *como* before a quantifiable noun phrase (23a), adjective phrase (23b), or prepositional phrase (23c) was eliminated.

(23)  a. Trabajé *como* ocho horas (3B1).

*I worked like eight hours (3B1).*

b. Son *como* thirteen thousand (16B2).

*There are like thirteen thousand (16B2).*

c. Esa pesadilla me siguió *como* por tres días (3B2).

*That nightmare stayed with me like for three days (3B2).*

Tokens of the use of quotative *como* (24), tokens of *como* in quotative constructions *como que* (25) and *es como* (26), *como* stacked with other quotatives (27), and *como* within direct quotation (28) were eliminated.

(24)  Es tu dinero, o sea, para que te lo quiten, *como*: “Ay ok” (12B1).

*It is your money, or rather, so that they take it from you, like “Ay ok” (12B1).*

(25)  *Como* que: “Pues ¿qué pedo?” (1B1).

*Like: “Well, what’s up?” (1B1).*

(26)  Y es *como*: “Si es tan exigente, por qué no está en la universidad y estás enseñando en el XXX” (5B1).

*And it’s like: “If you are so demanding, why aren’t you at the university and you are teaching at XXX” (5B1).*

(27)  Siempre nos dice *como*: “Tienen que hacer su resumen, que estar listos para la clase” (5B2).
He always tells us like: “You have to do the summary and be ready for class” (5B2).

(28) Y luego le dije: “pero ni tienen la salsa arriba de las alas” y φ: “Oh pues, como, ordenaste, y te-te pregunté” (16B1).

And then I told her: “But you don’t even have the sauce on the wing and φ: “Oh, well, like, you ordered, and I asked you” (16B1).

Tokens of como as the first-person singular form of the verb comer in the present tense (29) were also eliminated.

(29) 1B1: No paro. Tengo cuarenta minutos. Tengo un break.

1B1: I don’t stop. I have forty minutes. I have a break.

1B2: Y como (1BS).

1B1: And you eat.

1B2: And I eat (1BS).

The remaining tokens of como as discourse markers outside of the clause (30) or discourse particles within the clause (31) that upon removal did violate grammaticality or the semantic relationship between elements were included in the study. Any tokens of como that occurred inside of the clause, but before or after a pause, that is, outside of the scope of the sentence, were classified as discourse markers, as shown in (32).

(30) Como, no sé, no sé cómo funciona la verdad (1B1).

Like, I don’t know, I don’t know how it works to tell you the truth (1B1).

(31) Hemos tenido que escribir como ensayitos (12B2).

We have had to write like short essays (12B2).
(32) Tiene como, um, cuartos para guardar sus cosas (15B2).

*It has like, um, compartments to keep your things (15B2).*

In addition to the use of *como* in Spanish, the use of *como que* as a discourse marker (33a) and a discourse particle (33b), which has not been addressed in previous studies of *como*, was included in the analysis and coded as such.

(33) a. ¿Como que empezó a gritar? (1B1).

*Like she began to scream? (1B1).*

b. Estaba pensando como que en literature (12B2).

*I was thinking like about literature (12B2).*

Tokens of *like* inserted in Spanish discourse (34) were also included in the analysis, but tokens of *like* embedded in English code-switches were eliminated from the analysis (35).

(34) La otra vez le robaron algo, no sé, like, pues, no sé, hace como dos días o tres (8B2).

*The other time they stole something from him, I don’t know, like, well, I don’t know, like two or three days ago (8B2).*

(35) 3B1: Yeah I was really sad. I, I tried to like leave it out there cause

3B2: You didn’t- You never told me about this.

3B1: I didn’t tell you? Guardé el e-mail. Pero ya no lo tengo porque me hace depresionado. Me da depresión (3BS).

3B1: Yeah I was really sad. I, I tried to like leave it out there cause

3B2: You didn’t- You never told me about this.
3B1: I didn’t tell you? I saved the e-mail. But I now don’t have it because it makes me depressed. It depresses me (3BS).

Tokens of así como (36) and así como que (37) as discourse markers (a) and discourse particles (b) were coded, but eliminated from the analysis because there were only seven tokens of así como and eight tokens of así como que in the corpus.

(36)  

a. No, no he cambiado yo, like, así como, on purpose, no (8B1).

No, I haven’t changed, like, like, on purpose, no (8B1).

b. Sí, se me antoja ir a una boda pero a una boda así como padre y de México- en México se me antoja ir a una (12B2).

Yes, I would like to go to a wedding but a wedding like cool, and in Mexico- In Mexico I would like to go to one (12B2).

(37)  

a. Y pues así como que he aprendido cuando me sirva portugués (12B2).

And well, like I have learned when Portuguese comes in handy (12B2).

b. Fue poca gente porque fue así como que en Semana Santa (12B2).

Few people went because it was like during Holy Week (12B2).

Tokens of it’s like (38) in Spanish discourse as discourse markers, as well as the use of the referentially empty constructions es como (39) and es como que (40) were eliminated.

(38)  

It’s like, sigues yendo y hay un carwash en la esquina (8B1).

It’s like, you keep going and there is a carwash on the corner (8B1).
(39) Es como diferente, la secundaria que aquí, es como, tú tienes que ir a hacer, tú solo, tú tienes que tener, tú tienes que estudiar, tú tienes que, así, trabajar y todo (15B2).

It’s like different, high school than here, it’s like, you have to go do, you alone, you have to have, you have to study, you have to work and all (15B2).

(40) Nos puso una película sin subtítulos y es como que me perdí un poco, pero entendí (12B2).

He put on a movie without subtitles for us and it’s like I got lost a little but I understood (12B2).

Now that the forms have been circumscribed for the quantitative analysis, we now turn to function. As discussed in Chapter 1, quantitative analyses of discourse-pragmatic features have primarily counted all of the instances of a single form while disregarding function or have counted all of the forms that fulfill a single function (Evans Wagner et al., 2015; Tagliamonte, 2012). The use of like in English and como, como que, and like in Spanish in the present study is circumscribed by grouping tokens that fulfill the same macro-discourse function. Following Kern (2014), the present study opts for using the term focus to refer to the macro-discourse function of both like and como. Kern (2014) borrows the term focus from Underhill (1988) who claims that like fulfills a focus discourse function, which marks “the most significant new information in a sentence—often, the point of the sentence” (p. 238). Miller and Weinert (1995) argue that the focus like can mark both new or given information. When occurring clause-initially, the focus
“elucidates a previous comment” (p. 388) and when occurring clause-finally the focus like counters “objections and assumptions (p. 366).

The use of the term focus to refer to the macro-discourse function performed by both like and como in the present analysis does not refer to syntactic focus or to marking new information. Instead, it refers to drawing focus to units of discourse at the discourse level, which can happen either broadly outside of the clause or narrowly within the clause. Consequently, the use of like and como as discourse markers outside of the clause and as discourse particles within the clause can be grouped together as performing the same function of drawing focus to units of discourse. The difference between the use of like and como as discourse markers and discourse particles is not a difference in function, but a difference in scope. A limitation of this analysis is glossing over the multifunctional characteristics of these discourse markers, as discussed by Andersen (2001), James (1983), Miller and Weinert (1995), Schourup (1985), and Underhill (1988) among many others for like and Said-Mohand (2008) for como. While the present analysis does not analyze these micro-pragmatic functions, such as hedging (James, 1983; Underhill, 1988), the focus discourse function is sufficient to both encompass the macro-discourse function of these occurrences of like in English and the three equivalent Spanish variants to circumscribe the linguistic variable for quantitative analysis.

The use of like in English, and como, como que, and like in Spanish to fulfill a focus discourse function can appear in several syntactic positions. Regarding the focus like, Underhill (1988) argues that like can occur outside of the clause before a matrix clause or a subordinate clause or within a clause before a noun phrase, adjectival phrase, adverbial phrase, prepositional phrase, or verb phrase (pp. 243-244). Although like can
precede or enter noun phrases, verb phrases, adjectival phrases, adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases, there are places where *like* cannot appear, countering the assertion that *like* can appear anywhere in the sentence (Siegel, 2002). These contexts are outlined by Andersen (2011):

- *like* can precede but never enter proper nouns;
- *like* can precede but never enter compound nouns;
- *like* can precede but never enter noun phrases denoting time, distance, frequency, and age
- *like* can precede but never enter the semi-auxiliaries *have to*, *use to*, and *going to*, (but it can enter BE *going to/gonna* in the position immediately after BE)
- *like* can precede but never enter phrasal and prepositional verb;
- in a like-modified verb phrase whose tenses verb is a primary or modal auxiliary the tensed auxiliary must precede the marker (Andersen, 2011, pp. 283-284).

Andersen (2011) further proposes two constraints on *like*. The syntactic fixedness principle states that “the degree of syntactic fixedness of a phrase reduces the possibility of *like*-insertion in the phrase” (p. 284). The principle of lexical attraction states that “*like* tends to occur immediately before the lexical material of a phrase rather than before grammatical words” (Andersen, 2011, p. 284).

Kern (2014) finds that similar to *like*, the discourse *como* can be used both as a discourse marker outside of the clause and a discourse particle within the clause in Arizona Spanish. The discourse particle *como* can modify a determiner phrase, a prepositional phrase, an adjectival phrase, or an adverbial phrase (Kern, 2014). The present study explores the syntactic positioning of *like* in English and *como, como que*,...
and *like* in Spanish among in the speech of the same bilinguals in order to compare their linguistic conditioning in both languages and assess the role of contact with *like* in English in the use of the three Spanish variants.

Finally, several extralinguistic factors have been identified as significant in the use of *like* and *como*. Younger speakers are viewed as using *like* more frequently than older speakers (Dailey-O’Cain, 2000; D’Arcy, 2005; Tagliamonte, 2005). Regarding sex, there are conflicting results with some studies finding that women use *like* more than men (Andersen, 2001; Tagliamonte, 2005) and others finding that men use *like* more than women (Dailey-O’Cain, 2000). Different methodological treatments of *like* complicate these findings even more. D’Arcy (2005) finds that the use of *like* in different syntactic positions are conditioned differently according to sex with women using *like* as a discourse marker more frequently than men, but men using *like* as a discourse particle more frequently than women (p. 222). Attitudinal studies associate the use of *like* with women (Dailey-O’Cain, 2000; Buchstaller, 2006). Regarding extralinguistic factors in the use of *como*, Sánchez-Muñoz (2007) concludes that *como* is conditioned by register because she found that it was used significantly more frequently in informal conversations, than in interviews and class presentations in an academic setting. Regarding sex, Kern (2014) finds that young female bilinguals use the focus *como* significantly more frequently than young male bilinguals. The present study includes the social factors of sex, which has been found to be significant in previous studies, and language dominance, which has not been previously explored, to examine the social conditioning of *like* in English and three Spanish variants in the speech of these bilinguals.
2.4. Research Questions

This chapter analyzes the linguistic and social conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish in the speech of bilinguals from Southern Arizona to investigate the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals. The following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the relative frequencies of the use of *like* in English and *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish as discourse markers and discourse particles?

2. What are the similarities and differences in the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish? How do they compare in terms of the syntactic positions in which they can appear and their distribution as discourse markers and discourse particles?

3. Are sex and language dominance significant in the relative frequencies and/or the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish?

This study builds on previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations that have widely ignored the donor language by analyzing the linguistic and social conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que* and *like* in Spanish in the speech of the same bilinguals. In a similar study of discourse markers in English and Canadian French among the same French-English bilinguals, Sankoff et al. (1997) concluded that discourse markers were significantly more frequent in English than French for the majority of bilinguals and that the frequency of discourse markers in
French was correlated with fluency in French. However, Sankoff et al. (1997) did not explore the linguistic and social conditioning of these discourse markers in English. The novelty of the present study is that it analyzes not only the frequency but the linguistic and social conditioning of the use of discourse-pragmatic features in English and Spanish corpora comprised of data from the same Spanish-English bilinguals, which allows for the permeability of discourse in the speech of the same bilinguals to be assessed.

2.5. Methods of Data Analysis

The qualitative and quantitative analysis of the linguistic and social conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que* and *like* in Spanish in the speech of the bilinguals in the present study includes 3389 tokens of these discourse markers from eighteen hours of recorded conversations, nine hours in each language. The frequency of *like* in English and *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish per 10,000 words was calculated for each participant to give an overall view of their use. These frequencies were calculated by dividing the total number of tokens of each variant for each participant by each participant’s overall word count in each language and multiplying by 10,000. The transcription conventions that led to overall word counts are discussed in Chapter 1. Next, the overall distributions of *like* in English and the three Spanish variants as discourse markers and discourse particles were analyzed to explore their linguistic conditioning. Finally, the syntactic positioning of *like* in English and the three Spanish variants as discourse markers and discourse particles was explored and compared.

Three linear mixed-effects models were run to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and each of the
three Spanish variants. Another linear mixed-effects model was run to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and the combined Spanish variants. Three additional linear mixed-effects models were run to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the overall distributions of *like* in English and each of the three Spanish variants as discourse markers and discourse particles with the percent of these variants as discourse particles as the dependent variable. Another additional linear mixed-effects model was run to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the overall distributions of *like* in English and the combined Spanish variants as discourse markers and discourse particles. All eight of these models were run with random intercepts for each participant to take into account variation among speakers. As previously discussed, these methods of data analysis assume that a focus discourse function is fulfilled by both the use of *like* and *como* as discourse markers outside of the clauses and also their use clause internally with a change in scope, permitting the variable context to be circumscribed.

### 2.6. Analysis

The following analysis explores the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals by assessing the linguistic and social conditioning of *like* in English and its equivalent variants of *como*, *como que* and *like* in Spanish. The participants are equally divided by sex and dominance with an average language dominance score of 3.20 (5.06 for male participants and 1.34 for female participants). The analysis begins by exploring the overall frequencies of *like* in English and the three Spanish variants per 10,000 words per participant, which can be found in Table 2.1. In Table 2.1, participants are divided by sex
and arranged from most Spanish dominant to most English dominant. The participants’ numbers correspond to pairs.

**Table 2.1: Frequency of like in English and como, como que, and like in Spanish per 10,000 Words According to Participant, Sex, and Language Dominance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td>como</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B1 F</td>
<td>152.52</td>
<td>34.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B2 F</td>
<td>643.66</td>
<td>19.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2 F</td>
<td>229.71</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B1 F</td>
<td>268.92</td>
<td>36.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B2 F</td>
<td>468.42</td>
<td>136.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B2 F</td>
<td>129.05</td>
<td>12.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>334.68</td>
<td>49.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2 F</td>
<td>274.82</td>
<td>27.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B2 F</td>
<td>521.61</td>
<td>30.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>335.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B2 M</td>
<td>310.66</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B1 M</td>
<td>208.85</td>
<td>85.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B1 M</td>
<td>541.97</td>
<td>37.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B2 M</td>
<td>443.23</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1 M</td>
<td>407.39</td>
<td>12.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B1 M</td>
<td>233.90</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B1 M</td>
<td>372.48</td>
<td>216.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B1 M</td>
<td>548.82</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B1 M</td>
<td>396.11</td>
<td>38.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>384.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>360.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is presented visually in Figure 2.3.
Figure 2.3: Frequency of *like* in English and *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish per 10,000 Words According to Participant, Sex, and Language Dominance

As shown in Table 2.1 and Figure 2.3, the participants’ use of *like* in English showed greater cross-individual variability and was much more frequent, an average of 360.38 times per 10,000 words, than their use of *como* (55.98 times per 10,000 words), *como que* (8.35 times per 10,000 words) and *like* (16.88 times per 10,000 words) in Spanish. To confirm this observation, three linear mixed-effects models were carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and each of the three Spanish variants. Another linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and the combined Spanish variants. The first linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish. There was a main of effect of language ($\chi(1)=41.17$ $p < 0.05$) but sex and dominance were not significant. In English, *like* is used significantly more frequently
than *como* is used in Spanish regardless of sex and dominance. The high frequency of *like* in English does not appear to influence the frequency of *como* in Spanish. Figure 2.4 illustrates this main effect of language in the frequency of use of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish.

**Figure 2.4: Main Effect of Language in the Frequency of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish**

The second linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and *como que* in Spanish. There was a main effect of language ($\chi^2(1)=50.07 \ p<0.05$) and sex and dominance were not significant. In English, *like* is used significantly more frequently than *como que* is used in Spanish regardless of sex and dominance. The high frequency of *like* in English does not appear to influence the frequency of *como que* in Spanish. Figure 2.5 illustrates this main effect of language in the frequency of use of *like* in English and *como que* in Spanish.
The third linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and *que* in Spanish. There was a main of effect of language ($\chi^2(1)=48.34 \ p < 0.05$) and sex and dominance were not significant. In English, *like* is used significantly more frequently than *like* is used in Spanish regardless of sex and dominance. The high frequency of *like* in English does not appear influence the frequency of *like* in Spanish. Figure 2.6 illustrates this main effect of language in the frequency of use of *like* in English and *like* in Spanish.
The fourth linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of *like* in English and all three Spanish variants combined. There was a main of effect of language ($\chi(1)=37.39 \ p < 0.05$) and sex and dominance were not significant. In English, *like* is used significantly more frequently than the combined Spanish variants are used in Spanish regardless of sex and dominance. The high frequency of *like* in English does not appear influence the frequency of the combined Spanish variants. Figure 2.7 illustrates this main effect of language in the frequency of use of *like* in English and the combined Spanish variants.
In sum, *like* is used significantly more frequently in English than any of its three equivalent Spanish variants in Spanish, and all of these Spanish variants combined. Now that the frequency of *like* in English and *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish has been explored according to language, sex, and dominance, their overall distributions as discourse markers and discourse particles were explored. The overall distribution of *like* in English and the three Spanish variants as discourse markers (DM) outside of the clause and discourse particles (DP) within the clause according to each participant is presented in Table 2.2. Since discourse particles are considered to be a later development than discourse markers, analyzing the distribution of the use of *like* in English and *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish as discourse markers and discourse particles can provide a snapshot of their development.
Table 2.2: Distributions of *like* in English and *como, como que,* and *like* in Spanish as Discourse Markers and Discourse Particles According to Participant, Sex, and Language Dominance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
<td>como</td>
<td></td>
<td>como que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B1 F</td>
<td>69.57%</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16/23)</td>
<td>(7/23)</td>
<td>(10/18)</td>
<td>(8/18)</td>
<td>(3/4)</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B2 F</td>
<td>76.39%</td>
<td>23.61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(275/360)</td>
<td>(85/360)</td>
<td>(9/15)</td>
<td>(6/15)</td>
<td>(14/18)</td>
<td>(4/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2 F</td>
<td>67.74%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42/62)</td>
<td>(20/62)</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
<td>(3/4)</td>
<td>(4/4)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B1 F</td>
<td>73.20%</td>
<td>26.80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71/97)</td>
<td>(26/97)</td>
<td>(5/10)</td>
<td>(5/10)</td>
<td>(8/8)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B2 F</td>
<td>58.45%</td>
<td>41.55%</td>
<td>79.41%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(218/373)</td>
<td>(155/373)</td>
<td>(54/68)</td>
<td>(14/68)</td>
<td>(1/3)</td>
<td>(1/3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B2 F</td>
<td>71.93%</td>
<td>28.07%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41/57)</td>
<td>(16/57)</td>
<td>(3/5)</td>
<td>(2/5)</td>
<td>(1/1)</td>
<td>(0/1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>60.48%</td>
<td>39.52%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75/124)</td>
<td>(49/124)</td>
<td>(13/16)</td>
<td>(3/16)</td>
<td>(2/3)</td>
<td>(1/3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2 F</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87/116)</td>
<td>(29/116)</td>
<td>(5/8)</td>
<td>(3/8)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B2 F</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(259/350)</td>
<td>(91/350)</td>
<td>(9/9)</td>
<td>(0/9)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Female</td>
<td>69.40%</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
<td>71.24%</td>
<td>28.76%</td>
<td>84.21%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1084/1562)</td>
<td>(478/1562)</td>
<td>(109/153)</td>
<td>(44/153)</td>
<td>(32/38)</td>
<td>(6/38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B2 M</td>
<td>67.03%</td>
<td>32.97%</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124/185)</td>
<td>(61/185)</td>
<td>(10/19)</td>
<td>(9/19)</td>
<td>(2/2)</td>
<td>(0/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B1 M</td>
<td>74.12%</td>
<td>25.88%</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63/85)</td>
<td>(22/85)</td>
<td>(23/31)</td>
<td>(8/31)</td>
<td>(7/7)</td>
<td>(0/7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B1 M</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(114/133)</td>
<td>(19/133)</td>
<td>(8/14)</td>
<td>(6/14)</td>
<td>(2/2)</td>
<td>(0/2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B2 M</td>
<td>83.74%</td>
<td>16.26%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(170/203)</td>
<td>(33/203)</td>
<td>(4/6)</td>
<td>(2/6)</td>
<td>(3/3)</td>
<td>(0/3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1 M</td>
<td>78.87%</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(153/194)</td>
<td>(41/194)</td>
<td>(1/1)</td>
<td>(0/1)</td>
<td>(4/4)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B1 M</td>
<td>72.60%</td>
<td>27.40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53/73)</td>
<td>(20/73)</td>
<td>(1/1)</td>
<td>(0/1)</td>
<td>(4/4)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B1 M</td>
<td>56.47%</td>
<td>43.53%</td>
<td>84.44%</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48/85)</td>
<td>(37/85)</td>
<td>(38/45)</td>
<td>(7/45)</td>
<td>(20/20)</td>
<td>(0/20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B1 M</td>
<td>68.67%</td>
<td>31.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(171/249)</td>
<td>(78/249)</td>
<td>(3/3)</td>
<td>(0/3)</td>
<td>(4/4)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B1 M</td>
<td>70.18%</td>
<td>29.82%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120/171)</td>
<td>(51/171)</td>
<td>(9/15)</td>
<td>(6/15)</td>
<td>(6/6)</td>
<td>(0/6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Male</td>
<td>73.73%</td>
<td>26.27%</td>
<td>72.86%</td>
<td>27.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1016/1378)</td>
<td>(362/1378)</td>
<td>(102/140)</td>
<td>(38/140)</td>
<td>(20/20)</td>
<td>(0/20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>72.01%</td>
<td>27.99%</td>
<td>90.32%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2100/2940)</td>
<td>(840/2940)</td>
<td>(211/293)</td>
<td>(82/293)</td>
<td>(56/62)</td>
<td>(6/62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.8 illustrates the percent use of each variant as discourse particles according to participant, sex, and language dominance.

**Figure 2.8: Percent Use of like in English and como, como que, and like in Spanish as Discourse Particles According to Participant, Sex, and Language Dominance**

Illustrated in Table 2.2 and Figure 2.8, the overall distributions of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish as discourse markers and discourse particles appears to be conditioned similarly with 28.57% (840/2940) and 27.99% (82/293) of tokens used as discourse particles. However, the percent use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse particle exhibits much more variability among participants while the use of *like* does not. This result mirrors Kern (2014) who found that 22.73% (55/242) of tokens of *como* were used as discourse particles with high cross-individual variability. The use of *como que* and *like* in Spanish appear to be conditioned differently than *like* in English with only 9.68% (6/62) and 0% (0/93) of tokens used as discourse particles. To confirm these observations, three linear mixed-effects models were carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex, in the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and each of the three variants in Spanish with the percent use of each variant as
discourse particles by each participant as the dependent variable; a fourth linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex, in the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and the combined Spanish variants.

Let’s begin with comparing *like* in English with *como que* and *like* in Spanish, which appear to be conditioned differently. Regarding the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and *como que* in Spanish, there was a main effect of language ($\chi(1)=56.12 \ p < 0.05$) and sex and dominance were not significant. The percent use of *like* in English as a discourse particle was significantly greater than the percent use of *como que* as a discourse particle in Spanish regardless of sex and language dominance. This main effect of language is illustrated in Figure 2.9.

**Figure 2.9: Main Effect of Language in the Percent Use of *like* in English and *como que* in Spanish as Discourse Particles**
Regarding the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and *like* in Spanish, there was also a main effect of language ($\chi^2(1)=56.12$ $p< 0.05$), and sex and language dominance were not significant. The percent use of *like* in English as a discourse particle was significantly greater than the percent use of *like* as a discourse particle in Spanish regardless of sex and language dominance. In fact, *like* was never used as a discourse particle in Spanish. This main effect of language is illustrated in Figure 2.10.

**Figure 2.10: Main effect of Language in the Percent Use of *like* in English and *like* in Spanish as Discourse Particles**

Let’s now look at the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish more closely, recalling that they were used as discourse particles at relatively the same frequency 28.57% (840/2940) and 27.99% (82/293), but the use of *como* in Spanish demonstrated much more variability. As expected, there was not a main effect in the linear mixed-effects model, meaning that overall there was not a difference in percent use
of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish as discourse particles. However, there was an interaction between language and dominance illustrated in Figure 2.11.

**Figure 2.11: Interaction Between Language and Dominance in the Percent Use of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish as Discourse Particles**

![Figure 2.11](image)

Illustrated in Figure 2.11, there are no significant correlations in English, but in Spanish there is a correlation between language dominance and the use of *como* as a discourse particle for both male and female bilinguals. Specifically, as Spanish dominance increases (represented by the negative values in the Figure 2.11) so too does the percent use of *como* as a discourse particle. The use of *como* as a discourse particle therefore is a sign of dominance in Spanish for the bilinguals of present study.

The last linear model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and the three Spanish variants combined. In this model, there were main effects of language ($\chi(1)=6.59 \ p< 0.05$) and dominance ($\chi(1)=5.05 \ p< 0.05$) and an interaction between
language and dominance. The percent use of *like* in English as a discourse particle was significantly greater than the percent use of the combined Spanish variants as discourse particles. In Spanish, but not in English, the use the combined Spanish variants as discourse particles is correlated with Spanish dominance (p < 0.5). As Spanish dominance increases, so too does the percent use of the variants as discourse particles (Figure 2.12).

**Figure 2.12: Interaction between Language and Dominance in the Percent Use of *like* in English and the Combined Spanish Variants as Discourse Particles**

In sum, *like* in English and *como que* and *like* in Spanish appear to be conditioned differently. While *like* in English is used a discourse particle clause-internally, the use of *como que* in Spanish as a discourse particle was very infrequent, and *like* in Spanish was never used as a discourse particle. The use of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish are conditioned similarly with approximately thirty percent of tokens used as discourse particles. The use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse particle is positively correlated with
Spanish dominance. As Spanish dominance increases, so too does the percent use of *como* as a discourse particle. Overall, the use of *like* in English and the combined Spanish variants are conditioned differently. The percent use of *like* as a discourse particle in English is significantly greater than the percent use of the combined Spanish variants as discourse particles. The use of the combined Spanish variants as discourse particles is positively correlated with Spanish dominance.

Now that the overall distribution of *like* in English and *como, como que, and like* in Spanish as discourse markers and discourse particles has been explored, the analysis continues by exploring the syntactic positioning of *like* in English and the three Spanish variants as discourse markers and discourse particles. This provides a qualitative understanding of their linguistic conditioning. Beginning with the use of these variants as discourse markers, the use of *like* in English as a discourse marker can occur clause-initially before matrix clauses (41) or subordinate clauses (42).

(41) Like when they were about to take her in for surgery, **like** I was born (15B2).

(42) **Like** if I get in an accident and something really bad happens to me and I go to the doctor, like they don’t cover those bills (16B2).

D’Arcy (2005) argues that the definition of “clause-initial” must also include the left edge of TP (p. 114). Tokens of *like* in English that intervened between the head of the clause and the subject, as seen with clauses beginning with *because* (43) as well as in relative clauses (44), were found in the discourse of these bilinguals and classified as discourse markers that modified subordinate clauses.

(43) I felt the exclusion by them because **like** they would get together and they
wouldn’t let me know (5B2).

(44) They’re not celebrities, but they’re the people who **like** act (15B2).

The use of *like* in English also appeared on the right periphery (45). Although these tokens are infrequent, they were also classified as discourse markers.

(45) Because it was like my family was one, and two, it was my friends and a lot of them didn’t speak Spanish you know, **like** (12B2).

Similar to *like* in English, the use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse marker was also found clause-initially before matrix clauses (46); however, unlike *like*, it does not appear before subordinate clauses and it does not appear on the right periphery.

(46) *Y luego se queda, aquí, ((gesto)) como estoy bien flaco ahora pero aquí ((gesto)) estoy medio gordo* (8B1).

8B1: *And then it stays, here, ((gesture)) **like** I’m pretty skinny now, but here ((gesture)) I’m a little fat* (8B1).

Similar to *como* in Spanish, the use of *como que* in Spanish as discourse marker only appeared before matrix clauses (47) and did not appear on the right periphery.

(47) *¿Como que empezó a gritar?* (1B1).

*Like she began to scream?* (1B1).

Finally, all of the examples of *like* in Spanish occurred outside of the clause as discourse markers before matrix clauses (48), but four tokens appeared on the right periphery (49).

(48) *La otra vez le robaron algo, no sé, **like**, pues, no sé, hace como dos días o tres* (8B2).
The last time they stole something, I don’t know, like, well, I don’t know, it was like two or three days ago (8B2).

(49) Me siento que, como que, no um no estoy haciendo on purpose, like (8B1).

I feel that, like, no, um, I’m not doing it on purpose, like.

Table 2.3 summarizes the type of clause that each of these variants modify. All of the discourse marker variants highly favored positions before matrix clauses. Only like in English modified subordinated clauses, but did so very infrequently (5.05%; 106/2100), suggesting that the use of like in English as a discourse marker may be more developed than its equivalent variants as discourse markers in Spanish.

Table 2.3: Type of Clause of like in English and como, como que, and like in Spanish as Discourse Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td>como</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>94.95% (1994/2100)</td>
<td>100% (211/211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>5.05% (106/2100)</td>
<td>0% (0/211)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 summarizes the positioning of the use of these variants as discourse markers on the left and right periphery. All of the discourse marker variants favored the left periphery. Only the like variants in English and Spanish appeared on the right periphery, both very infrequently (1.67%; 35/2100 and 4.30%; 4/93 respectively).

Table 2.4: Periphery of like in English and como, como que, and like in Spanish as Discourse Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td>como</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Periphery</td>
<td>98.33% (2065/2100)</td>
<td>100% (211/211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Periphery</td>
<td>1.67% (35/2100)</td>
<td>0% (0/211)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sum, the differences in use of *like* in English and *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish as discourse markers are minimal, but it is important to note that none of the Spanish variants modified subordinate clauses, whereas *like* in English did appear before subordinate clauses, although very infrequently. This suggests that the use of *like* in English as a discourse marker may be more developed than the use of its equivalent variants as discourse markers in Spanish. Now that the use of *like* in English and the three Spanish variants as discourse markers has been explored, let’s continue with the use of these variants as discourse particles. The use of *like* in English as a discourse particle within a clause can modify a determiner phrase (50), a prepositional phrase (51), an adjectival phrase (52), or an adverbial phrase (53).

(50) It was **like** the first cool party we went to (1B2).

(51) I always see them **like** at XXX getting their makeup done (3B1).

(52) He told me internships there are **like** paid (5B1).

(53) I forget these things **like** really fast (12B2)

The positioning of the discourse particle *like* in English was sometimes ambiguous (54). When an adjective intervened between *like* and a noun phrase (54a), the use of *like* was classified as modifying a determiner phrase. When an adverb intervened between *like* and an adjectival phrase (54b), the use of *like* as classified as modifying an adjectival phrase.

(54) a. I remember, it was really fun, but that’s what I like most is **like**

tropical jungley places (17B2).

b. And there’s a lot of old people and rich people and they’re **like**

really rude (12B1).
The use of *like* in English as a discourse particle can also appear embedded within noun phrases (55), prepositional phrases (56), and adjectival phrases (57).

(55) Get it on a little **like** cotton ball thing (1B2).

(56) She just came with **like** the manager (17B1).

(57) It was really **like** clean (12B2).

Moreover, the discourse particle *like* in English can occur in the verbal domain between the subject and the verb (58), between a modal and a verb (59) (including *will* (59a), *would* (59b), etc.), between an auxiliary and a participle (60a), between an auxiliary and a gerund (60b), and between a verb + to + infinitive (61). There were also a few examples of *like* used in constructions with the passive voice (62).

(58) The beer pong table **like** was on the floor (5B2).

(59) a. If you’re using your phone they’ll **like** point at you (3B2).

b. I would **like** do my own thing (12B2).

(60) a. I’ve never **like** done that (5B2)

b. I was **like** walking around (12B1).

(61) I decided to **like** leave (12B1).

(62) I was **like** racially profiled (17B2).

The use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse particle within a clause can modify a determiner phrase (63), a prepositional phrase (64), an adjectival phrase (65), or an adverbial phrase (66).

(63) Hemos tenido que escribir **como** ensayitos (12B2).

*We have had to write like essays (12B2).*

(64) Está **como** en Phoenix (15B1).
It is like in Phoenix (15B1).

(65)   Está **como** igual (8B1).

   *It is like* the same (8B1).

(66)   Y después hacerlo **como** legalmente (12B1).

   *And then do it like legally* (12B1).

Similar to *like*, the positioning of the discourse particle *como* in Spanish was sometimes ambiguous (67). When an adjective intervened between *como* and a noun phrase (67a), the use of *como* was classified as modifying a determiner phrase. When an adverb intervened between *como* and an adjectival phrase (67b), the use of *como* was classified as modifying an adjectival phrase.

(67)   a.   Ella quiere tener **como** mucho dinero y todo (15B2).

   *She wants to have* like *a lot of money and all* (15B2).

   b.   Estaba **como** muy muy drogado (3B2).

   *He was like very very high* (3B2).

Regarding other syntactic positions of *como* in Spanish, there were two tokens embedded in noun phrases (68) and four tokens embedded in prepositional phrases (69).

(68)   Era una rosa **como** con brillitos (3B2).

   *It was a rose like with sparkles* (3B2).

(69)   5B2: Está bien padre en serio, y todos los días es fiesta también.

   5B1: Sí

   5B2: Pero más para **como** turistas en ciertas partes (5BS).

   *5B2: It is really cool seriously, and every day is a party too.*

   5B1: Yes
5B2: But more for like tourists in certain parts (5BS).

There were also only a few tokens of como in Spanish in the verbal domain with one token between the subject and a verb (70), and another example between an auxiliary and a verb (71).

(70) Ellos solo como vinieron a mi casa (15B2).

They only like came to my house (15B2).

(71) Es la única manera que puedes como entrar (1B2).

It is the only way that you can like enter (1B2).

The use of como que in Spanish as a discourse particle within a clause was very infrequent in the corpus, but there were three examples that modified a determiner phrase (72) and one example each that modified a prepositional phrase (73) and an adjectival phrase (74). There was also one token that appeared between the subject and the verb (75)

(72) Además quedaba como que algo para la comida, para los libros (12B2).

Additionally, there was like something left for the food, for the books (12B2).

(73) Estaba pensando como que en literature (12B2).

I was thinking like about literature (12B2).

(74) Estoy como que bien perdida (12B2).

I am like quite lost (12B2).

(75) Entonces ya verdad el XY como que entendió (1B2).

Then the truth, XY like understood (1B2).

In Spanish, like was never used as a discourse particle.
Table 2.5 summarizes the syntactic positioning of the use of *like* in English and the Spanish variants as discourse particles.

Table 2.5: Syntactic Positions of *like* in English and *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish as Discourse Particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Position</th>
<th>English like</th>
<th>Spanish como que</th>
<th>Spanish como</th>
<th>Spanish like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modifying an determiner phrase</td>
<td>39.24% (330/840)</td>
<td>54.88% (45/82)</td>
<td>50% (3/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying a prepositional phrase</td>
<td>4.64% (39/840)</td>
<td>18.29% (15/82)</td>
<td>16.67% (1/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying an adjectival phrase</td>
<td>14.74% (124/840)</td>
<td>13.41% (11/82)</td>
<td>16.67% (1/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying an adverbial phrase</td>
<td>1.07% (9/840)</td>
<td>4.88% (4/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between the subject and the verb</td>
<td>13.67% (115/840)</td>
<td>1.22% (1/82)</td>
<td>16.67% (1/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between a modal and the verb</td>
<td>4.64% (39/840)</td>
<td>0% (0/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between an auxiliary and gerund/participle</td>
<td>7.97% (67/840)</td>
<td>1.22% (1/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between the verb + to + infinitive</td>
<td>3.21% (27/840)</td>
<td>0% (0/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in a noun phrase</td>
<td>2.50% (21/840)</td>
<td>2.44% (2/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in a prepositional phrase</td>
<td>7.13% (60/840)</td>
<td>4.88% (4/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in an adjectival phrase</td>
<td>0.48% (4/840)</td>
<td>0% (0/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive voice constructions</td>
<td>0.59% (5/840)</td>
<td>0% (0/82)</td>
<td>0% (0/6)</td>
<td>0% (0/0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of *like* as a discourse particle in English most frequently modified determiner phrases (39.24%; 330/840). Its second most frequent positioning was before adjectival phrases (14.74%; 124/840), followed by the verbal domain between the subject and the verb (13.67%; 115/840). The use of *como* as a discourse particle in Spanish also most frequently modified determiner phrases with more than half of the examples in this position (54.88%; 45/82). Its second most frequent positioning was before prepositional phrases (18.29%; 15/82), which occurred relatively infrequently for *like* in English.
The discourse particle *como* also modified adjectival phrases (13.41%; 11/82), which was its third most frequent positioning. Unlike for *like* in English, there were only two tokens of the use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse particle in the verbal domain. The use of *como que* in Spanish a discourse particle was very rare with only six tokens, half of which modified a determiner phrase (50%; 3/6). Tokens of *like* in Spanish only appeared outside of the clause as discourse markers. These results mirror the overall distributions of *como que* and *like* in Spanish as discourse markers and discourse particles which both are primarily used as discourse markers, differing from *like* in English and *como* in Spanish.

In sum, although the use of *like* in English and *como* in Spanish are both used as discourse particles with a similar distribution, the use of *like* in English as a discourse particle is more widespread, occurring in many more distinct syntactic positions. Specifically, the use of *like* in English as a discourse particle occurs in twelve syntactic positions, whereas the use of *como* as a discourse particle occurs in eight syntactic positions, with more than half appearing in the determiner phrase. The use of *como que* in Spanish as a discourse particle is very infrequent and *like* in Spanish is not used as a discourse particle.

### 2.7. Discussion

Overall, this qualitative and quantitative analysis of *like* in English and *como, como que* and *like* in Spanish sheds light on the permeability of discourse in the speech of these bilinguals. It would be expected that discourse-pragmatic features would be highly permeable in contact situations because they appear on the periphery of grammar and are
detachable (e.g., Brody, 1987, 1995; Dajko & Carmichael, 2014). However, contact with English does not appear to radically influence the use of *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals.

The most prominent evidence of contact with English in the speech of these bilinguals is the use of *like* in Spanish. However, *like* in Spanish is significantly less frequent (only 16.88 tokens per 10,000 words) than *like* in English (360.38 tokens per 10,000 words). Moreover, *like* in Spanish is conditioned significantly differently than *like* in English because it is only used as a discourse marker and has not been incorporated in Spanish syntax as a discourse particle. Regarding the classification of *like* in Spanish as an example of borrowing or code-switching, Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that frequency is the most important factor. While borrowings are frequently used, code-switches may only be used once. The use of *like* in Spanish is infrequent but it is used more often than what would be expected for code-switching. Poplack and Sankoff (1984) argue that it is not only frequency of use that can determine if a single word exemplifies code-switching or borrowing, but also several other factors including native language displacement and morphophonemic and syntactic integration. The use of *like* in Spanish does not exhibit either of these criteria. There is no evidence that it has replaced other discourse markers in Spanish, and it has not been incorporated into Spanish grammar as a discourse particle. Several studies have argued that bilingual discourse-pragmatic features should be viewed as both code-switching and borrowings, entering a recipient through code-switching and later becoming established borrowings (Goss & Salmons, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Torres, 2002). The use of *like* in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals appears to fall somewhere in between code-switching and borrowing, exhibiting more of the
characteristics of code-switching.

The use of *como* and *como que* in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals may also be considered to be the result of contact with *like* in English. The use of *como* and *como que* in Spanish is significantly less frequent than the use of *like* in English. This result mirrors the results of Sankoff et al. (1997) who found that *comme* in French was used less frequently than *like* in English by the same French-English bilinguals. It also reflects the results of Jørgensen and Stenström (2009) who found that the use of *como* in Madrid, a non-contact variety of Spanish, was less frequent than the use of *like* in British English. Following Poplack and Levey (2010), a candidate for a truly contact-induced linguistic change must be absent or conditioned differently in non-contact varieties (p. 398).

The use of *como* and *como que* in Spanish are conditioned differently than *like* in English in the speech of the same bilinguals. The linguistic conditioning of *como que* in Spanish is significantly different than the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English because it is used primarily as a discourse marker. Although *como* in Spanish is conditioned similarly to *like* in English in its overall distribution as a discourse marker and a discourse particle, the use of *como* in Spanish is not as widespread as the use of *like* in English. The use of *como* as a discourse particle in Spanish occurs in fewer syntactic positions than *like* in English with over half of the tokens occurring in the determiner phrase. Spanish dominant bilinguals appear to be the leaders in the use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse particle, which may indicate their knowledge of Spanish syntax to be able to incorporate *como* within the sentence (echoing Poplack, 1980).
The differences in the frequency and linguistic conditioning between *like* in English and its equivalents *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish demonstrate that there has not been the displacement of discourse markers in the speech of these bilinguals. Salmons (1990), Torres (2002), and Torres and Potowski (2008) concluded that discourse markers in English were used at the expense of equivalent discourse markers in minority languages. In the Spanish of these bilinguals, *como* is the preferred variant while *como que* and *like* are very infrequent. There is no evidence of convergence to lessen the cognitive load (Fuller, 2001; Matras, 1998, 2000), fill a gap (Hill & Hill, 1986; Hlavic, 2006), or mark or strengthen discourse boundaries (Dajko & Carmichael, 2014; de Rooij, 2000; Maschler 1994, 1997, 2009).

The differences in the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish suggests that these four variants are at different stages in their development in the speech of the bilinguals of the present study. Previous analyses of the grammaticalization of *like* in English have shown that its development from preposition to conjunction to discourse marker reflects a broadening in scope (D’Arcy, 2005; Romaine & Lange, 1991), but has since begun to be re-incorporated within the sentence as a discourse particle (D’Arcy, 2005). The use of *like* in English in the present study is at this most advanced stage because it occurs frequently as both a discourse marker and a discourse particle and its use is widespread in terms of the syntactic positions in which it can appear. The use of *como* in Spanish appears to lag just behind the use of *like* in English, occurring less frequently as both a discourse marker and a discourse particle and occurring in fewer syntactic positions. The use of *como que* in Spanish is next in line in terms of its development because it is used relatively infrequently and almost exclusively
as a discourse marker rather than a discourse particle. Lastly, *like* in Spanish is at an initial stage in its development. It is used relatively infrequently and is only used as a discourse marker. The development of these four variants as discourse particles is presented visually in Figure 2.13, corresponding to D’Arcy’s (2005) proposal regarding the grammaticalization of *like* in English as a discourse particle (p. 210).

**Figure 2.13: Snapshot of the Development of *like* in English and *como, como que,* and *like* in Spanish Among Bilinguals**

![Diagram showing the development of discourse markers](image)

As illustrated in Figure 2.13, the use of *like* in English as a discourse particle has entered the verbal phrase. The use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse particle appears to just be beginning to enter the verbal phrase, but has entered the determiner phrase. The use of *como que* as a discourse particle in Spanish appears to be just beginning to be incorporated in the determiner phrase, while the use of *like* in Spanish is only used as a discourse marker.

The analysis of these four variants in apparent time is necessary to continue to explore this hypothesis of their different stages of development. Future studies should also continue to track the use of *como, como que,* and *like* in U.S. Spanish to assess if they continue their development as discourse particles and extend to more syntactic positions. For now, the results of this study on the linguistic and social conditioning of *like* in English and *como, como que,* and *like* in Spanish contribute to our knowledge of the limited permeability in discourse in the speech of bilinguals. They also underline the bilingual competence of these Spanish-English bilinguals who understand and reproduce the subtleties of these discourse-pragmatic features in both languages.
3.1. Introduction

Quotatives, or the linguistic expressions that are used to introduce direct speech, have been studied in several languages including English (Buchstaller & D’Arcy, 2009; Cukor-Avila, 2002; Rodríguez Louro, 2013; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2007), Spanish (Cameron, 1998; Holguín-Mendoza, 2015; Kern, forthcoming; Palacios-Martínez, 2013, 2014), French (Levey, Groulx & Roy, 2013), German (Golato, 2000), Swedish (Ericksson, 1995), and Hebrew (Maschler, 2001). They have also been studied in contact situations between English and French (Levey, Groulx & Roy, 2013) and English and Spanish (Holguín-Mendoza, 2015; Kern, forthcoming). The following examples of quotatives in English (1) and Spanish (2) were extracted from the present corpus of informal conversations in English and Spanish between pairs of Spanish-English bilingual friends from Southern Arizona.

(1) 7B2: But that day, last week, for whatever reason, it was so empty dude, in class, that I- me and XXX laughed at something on Reddit, and it was, we were at the middle, of the auditorium, where it was like, but there was nobody in front of us. So like, he looked, and he saw me and XXX laughing. And he’s, he’s just like, he’s like, “You two need to be quiet. Be a little more quiet.” And I was like “Oh, shit. Alright.”

7B1 & 7B2: ((laughter))
7B2: And then we were just freakin’ chillin. We were pretty quiet, you know, nothing, nothing happened. And so I go, and I have my, I have my foot like that ((gesture)), nah, I think, it was this one ((gesture)), it was definitely this one. And so I’m just like this ((gesture)), chillin’ and I was like, “Aw XXX.” It was close to the end of class, like five minutes. And I was like, “I wanna put my foot down, I was, it’s gonna be asleep.”

7B1: ((laughter))

7B2: And I ended up saying that that and he’s like, “Oh, yeah, it’s gonna be asleep?” He smacks the shit out of it!

7B1 & 7B2: ((laughter))

7B2: He smacks it, and it’s all loud, and I was like, “Oh, fuck!” And so like, obviously, once again, the teacher’s looking down, the teacher’s looking at everybody and there’s nobody in front of us, you know, to kinda dissipate some of the negative attention. And so he’s like, “I need to see you two after class.”

7B1: Oh!

7B2: And I was like, “Aw, man!” And he’s like “What- have you not noticed that I don’t, that I don’t take attendance?” He’s like, “If you want to be rude and disrespectful, like don’t come to class.” And I’m like, “Alright. Fair enough” (7BE).

(2) Entró a la clase, fue directo y se sentó conmigo y se me quedó viendo como que él me reconoció y yo no, así como cuando te pasa alguien por
enfrente y lo ves por primera vez y ya. O sea fue equis y ya XXX me dijo:
“Se te queda viendo. ¿Lo conoces?” Y yo “No” ((risas)) así como que
“Qué raro” ((risas)) Y ya después le pregunté a mi amiga de que: “Oye.”
Le dije: “Tengo en una clase a uno que se me hace que lo vi en tu
departamento.” Y me dijo: “¿Cómo se llama?” Y yo: “No sé.” Y me dice:
“Ah, pues, que ayudo.” Y ya al siguiente día oí que dijo XXX y se
presentó (5B1)

He came into class and went straight and sat with me and was staring at
me like he recognized me and I didn’t, like when someone passes in front
of you and you see him for the first time. Or rather it was whatever and
then XXX told me: “He’s staring at me. Do you know him? And I: “No”
((laughter)) like “How strange” ((laughter)) And then after I asked my
friend: “Look.” I told her: “I have someone in class that I think I saw in
your apartment.” And she told me: “What is his name?” And I: “I don’t
know.” And she tells me: “Ah, well, I’ll help.” And then the next day I
heard that he said XXX and he introduced himself (5B1).

This chapter analyzes the use of the English and Spanish quotative systems
among bilinguales from Southern Arizona and the similarities and differences in their
linguistic and social conditioning within and between languages. It begins by discussing
the grammaticalization of quotatives. This is followed by circumscribing the variable
contexts of quotatives in both languages. Finally, the analysis of the linguistic and social
conditioning of quotatives in the present corpora in English and Spanish comprised of the
speech of the same bilinguales is presented and discussed.


3.2. Grammaticalization of Quotatives

The use of *be like* in English as a quotative is a clear example of grammaticalization (Ferrara & Bell, 1995; Meehan, 1991; Romaine & Lange, 1991; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004, 2007; Tagliamonte & Hudson, 1999). Romaine and Lange (1991) argue that quotative *be like* originates from the same grammaticalization path as the use of *like* as a discourse marker (preposition > conjunction > quotative complement) (p. 261). Romaine and Lange (1991) write, “when *like* precedes a clause or a sentence which is a quotation, it functions as part of the quotation frame. Since English does not license verbless sentences, a dummy verb *be* is required to complete syntactically the quotation frame” (p. 261). Ferrara and Bell (1995) argued that the grammaticalization of *like* was ongoing, extending from introducing internal speech to introducing reported speech and from being used with the first person to being used with the third person. Tagliamonte and Hudson (1999) and Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2004) describe the grammaticalization of quotative *be like* as an example of “layering” in which its use is parallel to other functions of *like* as well as other quotatives such as *say* that remain to be used alongside it. By tracking the use of quotative *be like* in apparent time, Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007) were able to corroborate Ferrara & Bell’s (1995) hypothesis and identify three stages in the use of *be like*: Stage 1 favors internal monologue, the first person, and the present tense, with an insignificant sex effect; Stage 2 favors the first person and the historical present, with the leveling of the content constraint and a sex effect in which females lead; and Stage 3 favors the first person, highly favors the historical present, with a clear leveling of the content constraint and a strong female lead (p. 209).
Kern (forthcoming) concludes that contact with English is not a decisive factor in the use of quotatives in Arizona Spanish. Unlike *be like* in English, which has come to be favored over the use of *say, decir* (to say) remains to be the most common strategy of direct quotation in Spanish. By analyzing the linguistic conditioning of the English and Spanish quotative systems, this hypothesis can be explored further. The following section circumscribes the variable context of quotatives in English and Spanish.

### 3.3. Circumscribing the Variable Context of Quotatives in English and Spanish

The variable contexts of quotatives in English and Spanish are circumscribed by defining direct speech, identifying the strategies of introducing direct speech in both languages, discussing the linguistic conditioning of quotatives in both languages, and exploring the extralinguistic factors that influence their use. The analysis of direct speech in English has primarily been carried out through methods of discourse analysis including ethnography of communication, interactional sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, and variationist sociolinguistics. In her analysis of conversational narratives, Wolfson (1978) highlights the use of direct speech in which “the narrator plays the roles of the various participants in the drama making it seem more authentic by invoking the words of others” (p. 220). Schiffrin (1981) argues that direct speech increases immediacy. Through direct speech, “the narrative framework replaces the situation of speaking as the central reference point—becoming the locus for time, place, and person indicators, as well as the arena within which speech acts are performed” (p. 58). Tannen (1986) defines direct speech in conversation as “constructed dialogue” in which “experience surpasses story to become drama” (p. 312).
The earliest studies of direct speech in English center on verbs of saying, in particular, the verb *say* (Schiffrin, 1981; Wolfson, 1979). Wolfson’s (1979) concluded that *say* was the most frequent verb used in the narratives and was “pervasive in all reportings of direct speech” (p. 179). Schiffrin (1981) adds an analysis of *go*, which she differentiates from verbs of saying by noting that *go* can only be a verb of saying when it introduces direct speech. Tannen (1986) analyzes the use of quotatives in constructed dialogue and found that *say* was the most common quotative, but also found examples *go*, *like*, and null quotatives, also called zero quotatives by Mathis and Yule (1994).

The use of *be like* as a quotative in English began to be analyzed intensely in the early 1990’s (Blyth et al., 1990; Ferrara & Bell, 1995; Romaine & Lange, 1991). These studies highlight the use of *be like* as an innovation in English that could be used to introduce both thoughts and speech that was actually said. Soon after, Tagliamonte and her students began exploring the English quotative system from a variationist framework (Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004, 2007; Tagliamonte & Hudson, 1999). Tagliamonte & D’Arcy (2007) track the restructuring of the English quotative system in apparent time in which the use of *be like* is an innovation, an example of abrupt and rapid linguistic change.

In Spanish, the *Nueva gramática de la lengua española* (ASALE, 2009, pp. 3273-3274) defines direct speech as the literal reproduction of words or thoughts in their original form whereas indirect speech refers to the reproduction of words or thoughts from the perspective of the person who is reproducing them, as illustrated in (3) from the present corpus.
Y me dice “Es que tú eres mi novia,” y le dije que yo no era su novia y me dijo “Pero yo quiero que seas mi novia”, y le dije que no soy su novia porque tenía cuatro años y estábamos muy chiquitos para tener novios, que mi mamá me dijo que no podía tener novios hasta los treinta. Y me dijo que me iba a esperar hasta que cumpliera treinta (3B2).

And he tells me “It’s that you are my girlfriend,” and I told him that I was not his girlfriend and he told me “But I want you to be my girlfriend”, and I told him that I am not his girlfriend because I was four years old and we were too young to have boyfriends and girlfriends and my mom told me that I could not have boyfriends until my thirties. And he told me that he would wait until I turned thirty (3B2).

The bolded examples of decir introduce direct speech because they refer to the literal reproduction of words or thoughts in their original form, whereas the underlined examples introduce internal speech that are reproduced from the perspective of the person who is reproducing them, that is, this speaker many years later.

In Spanish, the ASALE (2009) states that direct speech is introduced by a verb of saying, such as decir, in oral language (p. 3275). In written language the ASALE (2009) states that direct speech can appear “free,” a null quotative, but only through the use of punctuation (p. 3275). Maldonado (1999) argues for an even narrower definition of direct speech in Spanish by excluding null quotatives as well as the reproduction of thoughts. According to Maldonado (1999) direct speech is the reproduction of words introduced by a verb of saying.
Following Kern (forthcoming), Cameron’s (1998) definition of direct speech will be adopted in the present analysis. When analyzing quotatives in conversations in Puerto Rican Spanish, Cameron (1998) found examples of verbs of saying used as quotatives in Puerto Rican Spanish, but he also found examples of null quotatives, as well as bare-noun phrases consisting of the conjunction y and a bare-noun phrase, which had previously been documented by Maldonado (1991). According to Cameron (1998) direct speech occurs when the “deictic orientation of the original speaker and source context is (re)constructed” (p. 51). Cameron (1998) circumscribed the variable context of quotatives by identifying three strategies of direct quotation as verbs of saying, bare-noun phrases, and null quotatives. He excluded predicative complements of decir or bare-noun phrases, embedded nouns or verbs, and complements of ser or estar.

In his study of quotatives in twenty-four sociolinguistic interviews in Spanish of young Spanish-English bilinguals from Southern Arizona, Kern (forthcoming) calls for expanding the variable context of quotatives in Spanish by adding quotative discourse markers including como, así, and o sea. The use of como as a quotative in Spanish has also documented in other contact varieties of Spanish, found in ethnographic recordings in El Paso and Juárez (Holguín-Mendoza, 2015), class presentations, interviews, and informal conversations in Southern California (Sánchez Muñoz, 2007), sociolinguistic interviews in Florida (Said-Mohand, 2008) and even in a non-contact variety in informal conversations among teenagers in Madrid. The use of así was documented in El Paso and Juárez (Holguín-Mendoza, 2015) and Madrid (Palacios-Martínez, 2013, 2014), while o sea was found in Madrid (Palacios-Martínez, 2013, 2014). In his analysis of quotatives in Arizona Spanish, Kern (forthcoming) argues that verbs of direct report, bare-noun
phrases, null quotatives, and quotative discourse markers appear to be conditioned differently. Verbs of direct report and null quotatives were used most frequently to introduce reported speech, but did not show a preference of grammatical subject. Bare-noun phrases predominantly introduced reported speech and were used with first-person subjects. Quotative discourse markers were used primarily with internal speech and first-person subjects. Although he analyzed the use of quotatives in the Spanish of Spanish-English bilinguals, Kern (forthcoming) did not find evidence of contact with English in the use of quotatives. He calls for more studies on the quotative systems in both Spanish and English to continue to explore linguistic conditioning of quotatives in U.S. Spanish and the possible role of English contact in their use.

Quotatives in English and Spanish are conditioned linguistically by tense, grammatical person and number, and content of the quote (Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2007). The following examples, which come from the present corpus of informal conversations between young Spanish-English bilingual friends, are presented to circumscribe the variable linguistic contexts of quotatives in English and Spanish. In English, quotative verbs were usually conjugated in the present (4), the historical present (5), or the past (6).

(4) I just want to run away. I’m like “Oh my God,” but no because I’m stuck here (8B2).

(5) And XXX called her dad right after and he’s like, “Who was it?” (17B2)

(6) I was like, “Damn. I feel scared right now. I feel like the guys can jump us and go like daredevil on us or something” (16B1).
Other tenses in English included the past habitual (7) with used to (7a) and would (7b) in English, the past progressive (8), the future (9) with will (9a) and going to (9b), and the imperative (10).

(7)  
   a. She used to be like "Yeah, I’m gonna do nursing...” (1B1).
   b. And yeah I would call my mom every day you know and be like, “yeah I’m alive” (12B2).

(8)  
And I remember I was at the cash register and the guy came with his family he was speaking to them in Spanish, “Hey, like what do you want, what can I get for you?” (5B2).

(9)  
   a. She’ll be like, "Ugh, we can’t go on like, dates anymore" (1B1).
   b. ‘Cause then it’s gonna be like, “Woah” (3B2).

(10)  
No, be like, “Yo! You’re going the wrong way!” (3B1).

Following Tagliamonte & D’Arcy (2007), a hypothetical category (11) was also created. In English, the hypothetical category included if clauses (11a) and the conditional or conditional perfect with would (11b), constructions with want to (11c), could (11d), should (11e) as well as constructions with negation (11f).

(11)  
   a. If he doesn’t, if he’s like, “ahh, I could care less,” then I’ll stay (1B2).
   b. I feel like if she wouldn’t have said anything we would’ve been like, “Oh, cool.”
   c. Is it weird that I wanna be like, “Screw all of you?” (1B2).
   d. Uhm, you like could be like “Who knew my baby would be four by now?” (1B1).
e. **You should just be like,** “Why?” (1B2).

f. **But it’s not like** “Oh I wanna go watch a game.” You know? I would never say that (12B1).

In Spanish, quotative verbs were usually conjugated in the present (12), the historical present (13), the preterite (14), or the imperfect (15).

(12) Siempre se ríe y **dice:** “¿Te acuerdas tu papá te regañó? Pensaba que te estabas comiendo los Halls por dulce” (8B2).

*He always laughs and says,* “Do you remember your father scolded you? He thought that you were eating the Halls like candy” (8B2).

(13) **Me dice:** “Hey vas a querer raite?” y le dije: “no” (12B1).

*He asks me,* “Hey are you going to want a ride?” and I told him: “No” (12B1).

(14) Entonces **dije:** “Ya me morí” (5B2).

*Then I said,* “I already died” (5B2).

(15) **Me decía** así siempre como que: “No puedo. Tengo tarea” (5B1).

*He always used to tell me like,* “I can’t. I have homework” (5B1).

Other tenses included the past progressive (16), the present perfect (17), the past perfect (18), and a hypothetical category including negation (19).

(16) Luego cuando fui a la dulcería pues ahí a que me inflaran los globos me **estaban preguntando:** “Y ¿por qué tanto globo?” Porque era un chorro. Literalmente no me cabía en el carro. Estaba aplastado en el carro cuando iba manejando (5B2).
Then when I went to the candy store for them to inflate the balloons for me, they **were asking** “And why so many balloons?” Because there were a lot. Literally, I didn’t fit in the car. I was squished in the car when I was driving (5B2).

(17) Pues su papá le **ha dicho**: “Oh, pues tú, no te puedo ayudar” (7B2).

*Well your father has told you, “Oh, well you, I can’t help you” (7B2).*

(18) Me **había textado**: “Vas a llegar tarde” (7B1).

*He had texted me, “You’re going to be late” (7B1).*

(19) No es como que puedes decir: “Ay sabes que me arrepiento” (1B2).

*It’s not like you can say, “Ay you know I’m sorry” (1B2).*

Regarding grammatical person and number, in both English (20) and Spanish (21), quotative verbs were conjugated in the first-person singular (20a and 21a), first-person plural (20b and 21b), second-person singular (20c and 21c), third-person singular (20d and 21d), or third-person plural (20e and 21e). Quotative verbs were not conjugated in the second person plural in the present corpus.

(20) a. **And I was like**, “Why?” (1B2).

b. **We’re like**, “Did you guys get it?” (15B2).

c. You go in there **you’re like**, “Oh, hi, can I please get this?” (12B2).

d. **He’s like**, “I have one” (3B2).

e. **And the cops were like** “Hey, like is everything okay?” (5B2).

(21) a. Le **dije**: “Soy tu estudiante. Me tienes que ayudar a graduarse” (16B1).
I told him “I’m your student. You have to help me graduate” (16B1).

b. Pero le dijimos: “Oyes, no más” (16B1).

But we told him: “Listen, no more” (16B1).

c. Así como dices: “Okay pues ya” (5B2).

Like you say: “Okay fine” (5B2).

d. Me dijo: “Pues se me hace que eras tú” (3B2).

He told me: “Well I think it was you” (3B2).

e. Me dijeron: “¡Ay XXX! Tú siempre te ríes de todo” (8B2).

They told me: “¡Ay XXX! You always laugh at everything” (8B2).

Quotative bare-noun phrases (22) in Spanish were also coded for grammatical person and number including first-person singular (22a), first-person plural (22b), third-person singular (22c) and third-person plural (22d). Quotative bare-noun phrases were not used with the second-person singular or plural in the present corpus.

(22) a. Y yo: “Hija de su madre” (12B1).

And I: “Daughter of your mother” (12B1).

b. Y nosotros: “No manches, aquí están” (5B1).

And we: “Come on, here they are” (5B1).

d. Y mi abuelita: “Sí, pues yo creo que sí porque tu carro es nuevo verdad?” (8B2)

Y my grandmother: “Yes well I think so because your car is new right?” (8B2)
e. Y **mis amistades** como: “Es muy buena onda. Pues está bien fácil. Te ayuda mucho” (5B2).

*And my friends* like: “He is really cool. He is pretty easy. He helps you a lot” (5B2).

Null quotatives were only included in English (23) and in Spanish (24) if there was a change in person or number (Ferrara & Bell, 1995; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004).

(23) My friend was also like, XXX’s like super Mexican and she’s like “Do you have crushed peppers, for the pizza?” And then they were like, ‘cause the- the, what they had was pepperchino which was basically crushed pepper. But they use that more as a seasoning for things. They don’t really like use it as a, like additive after it’s done. So they’re like, “We have some in the kitchen,” ∅, “Bring me some” (7B1).

(24) Cuando fui a la dulcería pues ahí a que mi inflaran los globos me estaban preguntando: “Y por qué tanto globo?” Porque era un chorro. Literalmente no me cabía en el carro. Estaba aplastado en el carro cuando iba manejando. Y ∅: “No, es que le estoy celebrando a mi mamá su divorcio. Y le voy a hacer una sorpresa.” ∅: “¿Es en serio?” (5B2).

*Then when I went to the candy for them to inflate the balloons for me, they were asking* “And why so many balloons?” *Because there were a lot. Literally, I didn’t fit in the car. I was squished in the car when I was driving. And ∅: “No, it’s that I’m celebrating my mom’s divorce and I am going to surprise her. ∅: “Are you serious?”* (5B2).
If a quotative was repeated without a change in person and number it was counted in both English (25) and Spanish (26).

(25) I was like, “What? Salty-ass.” I was like “Oh my god” (7B2).

(26) Me dijo: “Sabes que” Me dijo: “No te subas porque está alterado el caballo” (5B2).

He told me: “You know what” He told me: “Don’t climb up because the horse is angry” (5B2).

Non-human subjects of direct speech were eliminated in both English (27) and Spanish (28) because content of the quote could not be determined.

(27) When you wake up you wake up and the door closes like “Swoosh” (8B1).

(28) No se podía tener la ciudadanía con México y Estados Unidos hasta que México dijo “Ok, sí está bien” (12B2).

I could not have citizenship with Mexico and the United States until Mexico said “Ok, it’s ok” (12B2).

Regarding content of the quote, in both English (29) and Spanish (30), the content of the quote was predominantly reported speech (29a and 30a) or an internal monologue (29b and 30b).

(29) a. And she was like, “Why?” and I was like, “Everyone’s doing it on the same thing” (17B2).

b. I feel like she probably definitely doesn’t care cuz she’s like, “I already know Spanish so it doesn’t matter” (17B1).

(30) a. Al principio del semestre dijo la maestra: “Ok, el primer examen
va a ser de la mitad del semestre para atrás y el segundo examen va
a ser de la mitad para en frente (12B1).

*At the beginning of the semester the teacher said:* “Ok, the first
exam is going to be the middle of the semester and before and the
second exam is going to be the middle of the semester to the end
(12B1).

b. **Y yo en mi cabeza como:** “Si le gusta, de que no es la primera vez
que hace eso” (5B2).

*And I in my head like:* “Yes he likes it, this is not the first time he
is doing that” (5B2).

In English, other types of content of the quote included e-mail (31), texting (32),
social media (33), and television or movie dialogue (34).

(31) Well I’ll just email her today and **be like**, “Oops! I’m sorry! Here you
go!” (1B2).

(32) She literally texted me, **she’s like**, “Okay, you can go” (5B2).

(33) He was coming home and he tweeted about it. **He’s like**, “Oh, finally
coming home” (16B2).

(34) And then **they’re like** “Okay. Quagmire, I dare you to kiss that cow,”

**He’s like** “Okay.” **He’s like**, “Damn it!” I love *Family Guy* (7B1).

In Spanish, content of the quote also included texting (35) and social media (36).

(35) Y yo le mandaba mensaje diciendo: “Hey, ¿por qué estabas gastando mi
gasolina?” (16B2).
And I sent her a message saying: “Hey, why are you wasting my gas?” (16B2).


I saw that she put something on Facebook and I remained “Ah” I said to her: “I miss you.” I said to her: “Where are you?” and she never answered (8B2).

If the content of the quote was ambiguous according to the context of the conversation, the quotative was eliminated. In (37), it is not clear according to the context if the quotative was reported speech or an internal monologue.

Ooh! It’s gonna be lit. Like as soon as they said Donald Trump piñata, I’m like, “I’m in” (7B2).

Gesture was eliminated (38).

And so I’m just like this ((gesture)), chillin’ (7B2).

Finally, several extralinguistic factors have been included in analyses of the use of quotatives. In English, young people use be like more frequently than older people (Blyth, Recktenwald & Wang, 1990; Dailey O’Cain, 2000; Ferrara & Bell 1995; Romaine & Lange, 1991; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004, 2007; Tagliamonte & Hudson, 1999). Women were the leaders in the use of be like (Blyth, Recktenwald & Wang, 1990; Ferrara & Bell 1995; Romaine & Lange 1991; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004, 2007; Tagliamonte & Hudson, 1999), but men also use the quotative be like. Tagliamonte & D’Arcy (2004) suggest that men eventually use be like with the same frequency as women after it has spread through the community (p. 508). Dailey-O’Cain’s (2000)
attitudinal study finds that the use of *be like* is overtly associated with both young people and women. In Arizona Spanish among young Spanish-English bilinguals, Kern (forthcoming) found that young female participants in general used quotatives more frequently than male participants because they used direct speech more often than men. Lozano (2015) found that female participants used bare noun phrases and *como* more frequently than male participants. In Puerto Rican Spanish, Cameron (1998) concluded that women used bare-noun phrases more than men, but men favored null quotatives (p. 71). Regarding age, Lozano (2015) found that bare-noun phrases and *como* were used more frequently by younger participants in Arizona Spanish. In Puerto Rican Spanish, Cameron (1998) found that young participants used bare-noun phrases and null quotatives more often (p. 70).

### 3.4. Research Questions

This chapter analyzes the linguistic and social conditioning of the English and Spanish quotative systems among bilinguals from Southern Arizona in order to assess the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals. The following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the relative frequencies of quotatives in English and Spanish?
2. What types of quotatives are used in the English and Spanish quotative systems and what is their distribution?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the linguistic conditioning of quotatives in English and Spanish? Are quotatives conditioned by tense, person, or content of the quote?

4. Are sex and language dominance significant in the relative frequencies of quotatives, and/or their linguistic conditioning in the English and Spanish quotative systems?

This study builds on previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations that have widely ignored the donor language by analyzing the linguistic and social conditioning of quotatives in English and Spanish in the speech of the same bilinguals. In a similar study of the quotatives *be like* in English and *être comme* in Canadian French, Levey et. al. (2013) found that the innovative use of *être comme* in Canadian French was conditioned differently than its equivalent *be like* in English, leading the investigators to conclude that contact with English did not play a decisive role in the use of *être comme*. Although Levey et al. (2013) analyzed two different corpora collected during the same time frame, the corpora were composed of different speakers. The novelty of the present study is that it analyzes the linguistic and social conditioning of the use of discourse-pragmatic features in English and Spanish corpora comprised of data from the same Spanish-English bilinguals, which allows for the permeability of discourse in the speech of the same bilinguals to be assessed.

3.5. Methods of Data Analysis

The qualitative and quantitative analysis of the linguistic and social conditioning of quotatives in English and Spanish in the speech of the bilinguals in the present study
consists of 1304 tokens of quotatives from eighteen hours of recorded conversations, nine hours in each language. The frequency of quotatives per 10,000 words was calculated for each participant to give an overall view of their use. These frequencies were calculated by dividing the total number of tokens of quotatives for each participant by each participant’s overall word count in each language and multiplying by 10,000. Next, the linguistic conditioning of quotatives in both languages was explored according to tense, person, content of the quote, and sex. A linear mixed-effects model was run to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of quotatives. Two logistic mixed-effects models were run to assess the significance of content of the quote, sex, and dominance in the use of be like in English and decir in Spanish. The linear and logistic mixed-effects models were run with random intercepts for each participant to take into account participant variation.

3.6. Analysis

The following analysis explores the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals by assessing the linguistic and social conditioning of quotatives in English and Spanish. The participants are equally divided by sex and dominance with an average language dominance score of 3.20 (5.06 for male participants and 1.34 for female participants). The analysis begins by exploring the overall frequencies of quotatives in English and Spanish, which are represented in Table 3.1. These results correspond to the overall frequency of direct speech in both languages. In Table 3.1, participants are divided by sex and arranged from most Spanish dominant to most English dominant. The participants’ numbers correspond to pairs.
Table 3.1: Frequency of Quotatives in English and Spanish per 10,000 words per Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Quotatives in English</th>
<th>Quotatives in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Bilinguals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B1 F</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>106.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>53.64</td>
<td>30.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2 F</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>19.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B1 F</td>
<td>227.34</td>
<td>86.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B2 F</td>
<td>148.19</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B2 F</td>
<td>110.94</td>
<td>133.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>110.66</td>
<td>108.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2 F</td>
<td>118.46</td>
<td>58.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B2 F</td>
<td>102.83</td>
<td>20.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>106.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Bilinguals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B2 M</td>
<td>85.64</td>
<td>144.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B1 M</td>
<td>130.22</td>
<td>175.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B1 M</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>74.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B2 M</td>
<td>131.00</td>
<td>130.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1 M</td>
<td>113.40</td>
<td>152.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B1 M</td>
<td>92.92</td>
<td>24.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B1 M</td>
<td>144.61</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B1 M</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B1 M</td>
<td>37.06</td>
<td>46.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is presented visually in Figure 3.1.
Illustrated in Table 3.1 and Figure 3.1, the frequencies of quotatives in English and Spanish were similar at the group level and the individual level. A linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of quotatives. There were no main effects, but there was an interaction between sex and dominance ($\chi(1)=8.68 \ p< 0.05$). This interaction is illustrated in Figure 3.2.
For male bilinguals in both languages, the frequency of quotatives decreases as English dominance increases. For female bilinguals, the frequency of quotatives in English increases as their English dominance increases, but this correlation does not exist in Spanish.

In sum, there are no significant differences in the overall frequencies of quotatives in English and Spanish. Regarding sex, Kern (forthcoming) found that female bilinguals used quotatives and direct speech more than male bilinguals. This result is not found here. Regarding language dominance, Sankoff et al. (1997) found that the frequency of discourse markers negatively correlated with fluency in French. This result was found for male bilinguals in which the frequency of quotatives in Spanish decreased as English dominance increased, but this same result was also found for male bilinguals in English. This result was not significant for female bilinguals.
The analysis continues by looking at the forms of quotatives. The distribution of quotatives in English and Spanish can be found in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2: Distribution of Quotatives in Spanish and English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotatives in English</th>
<th>Quotatives in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Be like</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decir</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.68% (620/788)</td>
<td>50% (259/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Null quotatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Null quotatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33% (42/788)</td>
<td>12.16% (63/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Like</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bare-noun phrases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.95% (39/788)</td>
<td>7.53% (39/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It’s like</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discourse markers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.81% (30/788)</td>
<td>7.34% (38/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Say</strong></td>
<td><strong>Be like</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28% (18/788)</td>
<td>5.21% (27/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other verbs + like</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other verbs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16% (17/788)</td>
<td>4.83% (25/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other verbs</strong></td>
<td><strong>BNP stacked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.52% (12/788)</td>
<td>3.47% (18/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other quotatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quedarse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.89% (7/788)</td>
<td>3.09% (16/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decir</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quedarse stacked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.38% (3/788)</td>
<td>2.32% (12/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decir stacked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (788/788)</td>
<td>2.12% (11/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other verbs stacked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.93% (10/518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100% (518/518)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, nine categories of quotatives were identified: *be like* (39); *say* (40); other verbs of direct report including *go, ask,* and *tell* (41), verbs of direct report other than *be* stacked with *like* such as *say like* (42); *it’s like* (43); *like* (44); null quotatives (45); *decir* (46), and other quotatives including *be all* and *be just* (47).

(39)  And he was like “So, I’m moving to Denmark,” and I’m like “Okay” (1B1)

(40)  He said, “Hi” and then I obviously said “Hi” (16B2).

(41)  And XXX goes, “Hey XXX where you at?” (17B2).

(42)  They keep on emailing and saying like, “Oh, people are complaining to us” (8B1).

(43)  It’s like, “We’re not moving cross country” (15B1).

(44)  I really wanted someone’s opinion, like “How do I do this?” (3B1).
(45) I’m like, “Oh did you even apply?” Ø “Yeah like 3 hours ago.” (15B2)


(47) And we’re all, “Yeah” (15B2).

The most frequent quotative in English by far was be like accounting for nearly 80% of all of the quotatives in the English corpus (78.68%; 620/788). This was followed by null quotatives (5.33%; 42/788). The use of say was very infrequent (2.28%; 18/788). There were also three tokens of decir used in English (0.38%; 3/788), used by one participant.

In Spanish, there were multiple combinations of quotatives. Eleven categories of quotatives were identified: decir (48); quedarse (49); be like (50); other verbs of direct report including acordarse, decidir, gritar, hablar, llamar, mandar, pensar, platicar, preguntar, seguir and textear (51); decir stacked with quotative discourse markers including decir así como que, decir así de que, decir como, decir como que, decir de que, decir like, and decir o sea (52); quedarse stacked with quotative discourse markers including quedarse así como, quedarse como, quedarse como pues, quedarse como que, and quedarse de que (53); other verbs of direct report stacked with quotative discourse markers including andar como que, estar like, mandar como, mencionar de que, preguntar así como, preguntar de que, regañar de que, and ser de que (54); bare-noun phrases (55); bare-noun phrases stacked with quotative discourse markers including así como que, como, como que, de que, and pues (56); quotative discourse markers including como, así como, así como que, como que, es así como que, es como, es de que, de que, it’s like, like, o sea, and pues (57); and null quotatives (58).
(48) Me desperté. Todavía no sonaba mi alarma y dije: “No me quiero levantar” (12B1).

_I woke up. My alarm hadn’t gone off yet, and I said: “I don’t want to get up” (12B1)._  

(49) Y yo me quedé: “¿Qué?” tan desesperada, “No te puedo creer” (8B2).

_And I remained: “What?” so desperate, “I can’t believe you” (8B2)._  

(50) She’s like: “I’m sorry perdóname.” I was like: “Uh, no puede ser” (16B1).

_She’s like: “I’m sorry I’m sorry.” I was like: “Uh, It can’t be” (16B1)._  

(51) Me estaban preguntando: “¿Y por qué tanto globo?” (5B2).

_They were asking me: “And why so many balloons?” (5B2)._  

(52) Empezó a decir así como que: “No puedes ayudar una persona si ellos no se quieren ayudar ellos mismos” (8B1).

_He began to say like: “You can’t help a person if they do not want to help themselves” (8B1)._  

(53) Me quedé así como: “No, sí está hablando de mi” (8B1).

_I remained like: “No, he is speaking about me” (8B1)._  

(54) Me regañaba de que: “Tú vas a pagar la luz” (5B1).

_He scolded me about: “You are going to pay for the electric” (5B1)._  

(55) Nunca me habían llamado a la oficina y yo: “¿Qué pasó?” (5B1).

_They had never called me at the office and I: “What happened?” (5B1)._  

(56) Y yo de que: “Se llama XXX” (5B1).

_And I all: “His name is XXX” (5B1)._
(57)  Es tu dinero o sea para que te lo quiten, **como**: “Ay ok” (12B1).

*It is your money, or rather, so that they take it from you, **like** “Ay ok”*

(12B1).

(58)  Y ∅: “No, es que le estoy celebrando a mi mamá su divorcio. Y le voy a hacer una sorpresa.” ∅: “¿Es en serio?” (5B2).

*And ∅: “No, it’s that I’m celebrating my mom’s divorce and I am going to surprise her.” ∅: “Are you serious?”* (5B2).

The most frequent quotative in Spanish was **decir** accounting for exactly half of all of the quotatives in the Spanish corpus (50%; 259/518). This was followed by null quotatives (12.16%; 63/518). The use of **be like** was also found in Spanish, but was very infrequent (5.21%, 27/518).

In sum, both quotative systems have a preferred variant: **be like** in English and **decir** in Spanish. The elevated use of **be like** in English among younger speakers has been found in other studies of quotatives in English (Buchstaller & D’Arcy, 2009; D’Arcy & Tagliamonte, 2007). The Spanish quotative system presents many more variants than the English quotative system. Numerous Spanish variants have also been documented by Holguín Mendoza (2015) in El Paso and Juárez. The elevated use of **decir** has been found in every previous study of quotatives in Spanish in both contact (Holguín-Mendoza, 2015; Kern, forthcoming) and non-contact (Cameron, 1998; Palacios-Martínez, 2013, 2014) varieties. It is clear that the change in the English quotative system in which **be like** has become the preferred variant to **say**, has not happened in Spanish, even in the speech of Spanish-English bilinguals. There is very little evidence of the transfer of forms in the
speech of these bilinguals. There were three tokens of *decir* in English used by one participant and the use of *be like* in Spanish was also very infrequent.

Now that the forms of quotatives in both languages have been discussed, the analysis turns to the linguistic conditioning of quotatives according to tense, grammatical person and number, content of the quote, and sex, which were outlined by Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007) as relevant for the development and the use of *be like* in English. Kern (forthcoming) also found that grammatical person, content of the quote, and sex were significant for quotatives in Arizona Spanish. Table 3.3 and Table 3.4 show the variation of quotatives in English and Spanish respectively according to tense.

### Table 3.3: Variation of Quotatives in English According to Tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Be like</em></td>
<td>8.23% (51/620)</td>
<td>40% (248/620)</td>
<td>43.71% (271/620)</td>
<td>8.06% (50/620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Say</em></td>
<td>11.11% (2/18)</td>
<td>60% (11/18)</td>
<td>0% (0/18)</td>
<td>27.78% (5/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs + <em>like</em></td>
<td>0% (0/17)</td>
<td>11.76% (2/17)</td>
<td>58.82% (10/17)</td>
<td>29.41% (5/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>33.33% (4/12)</td>
<td>25% (3/12)</td>
<td>16.67% (2/12)</td>
<td>25% (3/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quotatives</td>
<td>0% (0/7)</td>
<td>14.29% (1/7)</td>
<td>85.71% (6/7)</td>
<td>0% (0/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em></td>
<td>33.33% (1/3)</td>
<td>66.67% (2/3)</td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.57% (58/677)</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.44% (267/677)</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.69% (289/677)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.31% (63/677)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.4: Variation of Quotatives in Spanish According to Tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em></td>
<td>5.79% (14/259)</td>
<td>77.99% (202/259)</td>
<td>3.86% (10/259)</td>
<td>11.58% (30/259)</td>
<td>1.16% (3/259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Be like</em></td>
<td>0% (0/27)</td>
<td>55.56% (15/27)</td>
<td>0% (0/27)</td>
<td>44.44% (12/27)</td>
<td>0% (0/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>8% (2/25)</td>
<td>56% (14/25)</td>
<td>4% (1/25)</td>
<td>24% (6/25)</td>
<td>8% (2/25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quedarse</em></td>
<td>0% (0/16)</td>
<td>87.5% (14/16)</td>
<td>6.25% (1/16)</td>
<td>6.25% (1/16)</td>
<td>0% (0/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quedarse</em> stacked</td>
<td>25% (3/12)</td>
<td>66.67% (8/12)</td>
<td>8.33% (1/12)</td>
<td>0% (0/12)</td>
<td>0% (0/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em> stacked</td>
<td>18.18% (2/11)</td>
<td>63.64% (7/11)</td>
<td>18.18% (2/11)</td>
<td>0% (0/11)</td>
<td>0% (0/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs stacked</td>
<td>10% (1/10)</td>
<td>40% (4/10)</td>
<td>40% (4/10)</td>
<td>0% (0/10)</td>
<td>10% (1/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.11% (22/360)</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.33% (64/360)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.28% (19/360)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.61% (49/360)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.67% (6/360)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the similarities and differences between the use of quotatives in English and Spanish according to tense, quotative verbs in English were used most frequently with the historical present (42.69%; 289/677) and the past (39.44%; 267/677). The use of *be like* in English mirrors these results, used most frequently with the historical present (43.71%; 271/620) and the past (40%; 248/620). This result is consistent with D’Arcy and Tagliamonte’s (2007) youngest speakers. Although there are only 18 tokens of *say* in English, it was never used with the historical present (0% 0/18), favoring the past (60%; 11/18). In Spanish, quotative verbs were used most frequently with the preterite tense (73.33%; 64/360), but were used relatively infrequently with the historical present (13.61%; 49/360). The use of *decir* mirrors this pattern, used most frequently with the preterite tense (77.99%; 202/259) and relatively infrequently with the historical present (11.58%; 30/259). These results conflict with Palacios Martínez (2014) who found that quotatives in Spanish including *decir* were overwhelming used the present tense. The use of *be like* in Spanish appears to mirror the use of *be like* in English, used with both the preterite tense (55.56%; 15/27) and the historical present (44.44%, 12/27).

Table 3.5 and Table 3.6 show the variation of quotatives in English and Spanish respectively according to grammatical person.

**Table 3.5: Variation of Quotatives in English According to Grammatical Person**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be like</td>
<td>52.26% (324/620)</td>
<td>2.74% (17/620)</td>
<td>44.19% (274/620)</td>
<td>0.81% (5/620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>16.67% (3/18)</td>
<td>22.22% (4/18)</td>
<td>61.11% (11/18)</td>
<td>0% (0/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs + like</td>
<td>23.52% (4/17)</td>
<td>11.76% (2/17)</td>
<td>64.71% (11/17)</td>
<td>0% (0/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>16.78% (2/12)</td>
<td>8.33% (1/12)</td>
<td>66.67% (8/12)</td>
<td>8.33% (1/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quotatives</td>
<td>57.14% (4/7)</td>
<td>0% (0/7)</td>
<td>42.86% (3/7)</td>
<td>0% (0/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decir</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.22% (340/677)</td>
<td>3.56% (25/677)</td>
<td>45.35% (307/677)</td>
<td>0.89% (6/677)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6: Variation of Quotatives in Spanish According to Grammatical Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em></td>
<td>47.49% (123/259)</td>
<td>1.54% (4/259)</td>
<td>50.97% (132/259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare-noun phrases</td>
<td>76.92% (30/39)</td>
<td>0% (0/39)</td>
<td>23.08% (9/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Be like</em></td>
<td>70.37% (19/27)</td>
<td>0% (0/27)</td>
<td>29.63% (8/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>20% (5/25)</td>
<td>0% (0/25)</td>
<td>80% (20/25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP stacked</td>
<td>83.33% (15/18)</td>
<td>0% (0/18)</td>
<td>16.67% (3/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quedarse</em></td>
<td>100% (16/16)</td>
<td>0% (0/16)</td>
<td>0% (0/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quedarse</em> stacked</td>
<td>83.33% (10/12)</td>
<td>8.33% (1/12)</td>
<td>8.33% (1/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em> stacked</td>
<td>27.27% (3/11)</td>
<td>0% (0/11)</td>
<td>72.72% (8/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs stacked</td>
<td>60% (6/10)</td>
<td>0% (0/10)</td>
<td>40% (4/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.44% (227/417)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.20% (5/417)</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.36% (185/417)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the similarities and differences between the use of quotatives in English and Spanish according to grammatical person, quotatives in English were used most frequently with the first-person (52.26%; 324/620) and the third-person (45.35%; 307/677). The use of *be like* in English mirrors these results, used most frequently with the first-person (44.19%; 274/620) and the third-person (44.28%; 275/621). This result is consistent with Tagliamonte and D’Arcy’s (2007) youngest speakers. Quotatives in Spanish had a similar distribution according to grammatical person used with the both the first-person (54.44%; 227/417) and the third-person (44.36%; 185/417). The use of *decir* was used approximately equally with the first-person (47.49%; 123/259) and the third-person (50.97%; 132/259), which was also found by Kern (forthcoming). Bare-noun phrases (76.92%; 30/39) and *quedarse* (100%; 16/16) favored the first-person, also corroborating Kern (forthcoming). The use of *be like* in Spanish also favored the first-person (70.37%; 19/27), differing from its distribution in English in the speech of the same bilinguals.

Table 3.7 and Table 3.8 show the variation of quotatives in English and Spanish respectively according to content of the quote.
Table 3.7: Variation of Quotatives in English According to Content of the Quote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>Reported Speech</th>
<th>Internal Monologue</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Be like</strong></td>
<td>65.97% (409/620)</td>
<td>26.45% (164/620)</td>
<td>7.58% (47/620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null quotatives</td>
<td>52.38% (22/42)</td>
<td>28.57% (12/42)</td>
<td>19.05% (8/42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Like</strong></td>
<td>30.77% (12/39)</td>
<td>61.54% (24/39)</td>
<td>7.69% (3/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It’s like</strong></td>
<td>3.33% (1/30)</td>
<td>93.33% (28/30)</td>
<td>3.33% (1/30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Say</strong></td>
<td>94.44% (17/18)</td>
<td>5.62% (1/18)</td>
<td>0% (0/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs + like</td>
<td>88.24% (15/17)</td>
<td>0% (0/17)</td>
<td>11.76% (2/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>83.33% (10/12)</td>
<td>16.67% (2/12)</td>
<td>0% (0/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quotatives</td>
<td>71.43% (5/7)</td>
<td>28.57% (2/7)</td>
<td>0% (0/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decir</strong></td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62.69% (494/788)</td>
<td>29.57% (233/788)</td>
<td>7.74% (61/788)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8: Variation of Quotatives in Spanish According to Content of the Quote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>Reported Speech</th>
<th>Internal Monologue</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decir</strong></td>
<td>88.03% (228/259)</td>
<td>8.49% (22/259)</td>
<td>3.47% (9/259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null quotatives</td>
<td>85.71% (54/63)</td>
<td>12.70% (8/63)</td>
<td>1.59% (1/63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare-noun phrases</td>
<td>64.10% (25/39)</td>
<td>35.90% (14/39)</td>
<td>0% (0/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>28.95% (11/38)</td>
<td>71.05% (27/38)</td>
<td>0% (0/38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Be like</strong></td>
<td>48.15% (13/27)</td>
<td>51.85% (14/27)</td>
<td>0% (0/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>84% (21/25)</td>
<td>4% (1/25)</td>
<td>12% (3/25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP stacked</td>
<td>44.44% (8/18)</td>
<td>55.56% (10/18)</td>
<td>0% (0/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quedarse</strong></td>
<td>25% (4/16)</td>
<td>75% (12/16)</td>
<td>0% (0/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quedarse stacked</strong></td>
<td>8.33% (1/12)</td>
<td>91.67% (11/12)</td>
<td>0% (0/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decir stacked</strong></td>
<td>90.91% (10/11)</td>
<td>9.09% (1/11)</td>
<td>0% (0/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs stacked</td>
<td>60% (6/10)</td>
<td>30% (3/10)</td>
<td>10% (1/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.55% (381/518)</td>
<td>23.75% (123/518)</td>
<td>2.70% (14/518)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the similarities and differences between the use of quotatives in English and Spanish according to the content of the quote, quotatives in English were used most frequently to introduce reported speech (62.69%; 494/788) rather than internal monologue (29.57%; 233/788). The use of be like in English mirrors these results used most often to introduce reported speech (65.97%; 409/620). This result conflicts with Tagliamonte and D’Arcy’s (2007) who found the leveling of the content of the quote constraint among their youngest speakers. Quotatives in Spanish also favored reported speech over internal monologue. The use of decir (88.03%; 228/259) and null quotatives
(85.71%; 54/63) in Spanish almost always introduced reported speech, which was also found by Holguín Mendoza (2015) and Kern (forthcoming). Bare-noun phrases also favored reported speech (64.10% (25/39), which was also found by Holguín Mendoza (2015) and Kern (forthcoming). Quotative discourse markers (71.05%; 27/38) favored internal monologue, corroborating Kern (forthcoming) who also found that quotative discourse markers were conditioned differently according to content of the quote. The use of *be like* in Spanish also favored internal monologue (51.85%; 14/27), differing from the use of *be like* in English in the speech of the same bilinguals.

Table 3.9 and Table 3.10 show the variation of quotatives in English and Spanish respectively according to sex.

### Table 3.9: Variation of Quotatives in English According to Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Be like</em></td>
<td>60.81% (377/620)</td>
<td>39.19% (243/620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null quotatives</td>
<td>33.33% (14/42)</td>
<td>66.67% (28/42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Like</em></td>
<td>38.46% (15/39)</td>
<td>61.54% (24/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>It’s like</em></td>
<td>56.67% (17/30)</td>
<td>43.33% (13/30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Say</em></td>
<td>61.11% (11/18)</td>
<td>38.89% (7/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs + <em>like</em></td>
<td>70.59% (12/17)</td>
<td>29.41% (5/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>75% (9/12)</td>
<td>25% (3/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quotatives</td>
<td>85.71% (6/7)</td>
<td>14.29% (1/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em></td>
<td>0% (0/3)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.50% (461/788)</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.50% (327/788)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.10: Variation of Quotatives in Spanish According to Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotative</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em></td>
<td>40.15% (104/259)</td>
<td>59.84% (155/259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null quotatives</td>
<td>28.57% (18/63)</td>
<td>71.43% (45/63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare-noun phrases</td>
<td>71.79% (28/39)</td>
<td>28.21% (11/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>52.63% (20/38)</td>
<td>47.37% (18/38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Be like</em></td>
<td>44.44% (12/27)</td>
<td>55.56% (15/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other verbs</td>
<td>24% (6/25)</td>
<td>76% (19/25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP stacked</td>
<td>66.67% (12/18)</td>
<td>33.33% (6/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quedarse</em></td>
<td>93.75% (15/16)</td>
<td>6.25% (1/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quedarse</em> stacked</td>
<td>41.67% (5/12)</td>
<td>58.33% (7/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Decir</em> stacked</td>
<td>63.64% (7/11)</td>
<td>36.36% (4/11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the similarities and differences between the use of quotatives in English and Spanish according to sex, female bilinguals appear to favor the use of quotatives in English overall (58.50%; 461/788). The use of *be like* in English mirrors these results and was used more often by female bilinguals 60.81% (377/620). This result is consistent with Tagliamonte & D’Arcy’s (2007) youngest speakers. Quotatives in Spanish were used approximately equally between male and female bilinguals with male bilinguals slightly favoring overall (55.21%; 286/518). This result conflicts with Kern (forthcoming) who found that quotatives in Spanish were used much more frequently by female bilinguals. It also conflicts with Cameron (1998) who found that female speakers used quotatives slightly more frequently than male speakers and The use of *decir* in Spanish reflects the overall results and is favored by male bilinguals (59.84%; 155/259). Null quotatives were even more strongly favored by male bilinguals (71.43%; 45/63). This result is consistent with Cameron (1998) who found that males used null quotatives more than females. Bare-noun phrases (71.79%; 28/39) were favored by female bilinguals, which is also consistent with Cameron (1998). Quotative discourse markers did not demonstrate a clear preference.

Now that the overall distribution of quotatives according to tense, grammatical, person, content of the quote, and sex has been presented, the analysis continues by exploring the significance of these linguistic and social factors for the most frequent quotatives in each language: *be like* in English and *decir* in Spanish. Not only was *be like* the preferred quotative in English, used approximately 80% of the time, it was used approximately 91% of the time (620/677) in contexts in which a verb was present. This
result is consistent with the rapid change in the English quotative system among young people with *be like* replacing the use of *say* (Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2004, 2007). There were only 18 tokens of *say* as a quotative in the entire corpus (2.28%; 18/788).

Regarding the linguistic and social conditioning of *be like*, the constraints for the third stage of its development identified by Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007) are the favoring the historical present and the first person, the leveling of the content constraint, and a strong female lead. Since *be like* is used so much more frequently than other verbs in the present corpus, assessing the significance of tense and grammatical person in the use or non-use of *be like* is futile since there is little variation. Overall, the percent use of *be like* according to tense and grammatical person aligns with the constraints for the third stage of its development identified by Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007) who found that *be like* favored the historical present and the first-person. However, *be like* was also used with the past tense and the third-person so it appears that some leveling of the tense and grammatical person constraints has occurred. Regarding the remaining linguistic and social factors, a logistic mixed-effects model was carried to assess the significance of content of the quote, sex, and dominance in the use of *be like*. Only the tokens of *be like* that introduced internal monologue or reported speech were included in the analysis since they were the most frequent types of content of the quote. There was a main effect of content of the quote ($\chi(1)=9.86 \ p< 0.05$) and sex and dominance were not significant. This means that *be like* introduced reported speech significantly more often than internal speech regardless of sex and dominance. These results conflict with the leveling of the content of the quote constraint and the strong female lead proposed by Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007). They suggest that there may be a fourth stage in the development of *be
like in English with the leveling of tense, grammatical person, and sex, and a preference for reported speech.

In Spanish, the use of decir accounts for 50% of quotatives. In contexts in which verbs were present, decir was used 71.94% (259/360) of the time. Similar to be like, since decir is used so much more frequently than other verbs, assessing the significance of tense and grammatical person in the use or non-use of decir is futile since there is little variation. Overall, decir was primarily used with the preterite tense and with both the first and third person. Regarding the remaining linguistic and social factors, a logistic mixed-effects model was carried to assess the significance of content of the quote, sex, and dominance in the use of decir. Only the tokens of decir that introduced internal monologue or reported speech were included in the analysis since they are the most frequent types of content of the quote. There was a main effect of content of the quote ($\chi(1)=65.78 \ p< 0.05$) and sex and dominance were not significant. This means that decir introduced reported speech significantly more often than internal speech regardless of sex and dominance. This result is consistent with Holguín Mendoza (2015) and Kern (forthcoming) who also found that decir was used most often to introduce reported speech. This result is also found qualitatively, as illustrated in (59) in which a female bilingual avoids the use of decir when talking about her internal monologue during a dream.

(59) 8B2: Yo tuve un sueño nomás que gente se muere y me despierto llorando. Una vez me vi muerta y era mi espíritu ahí nomás llorando. Voy a llorar. No sé cómo me morí, pero nomás puedo decir que la gente sí me extrañó.
8B1: ¿Sí, y eso por qué?

8B2: No sé. Ya voy a llorar. It was really emotional for me.

8B1: Sí, estás llorando

8B2: No, no pues me espanté. Θ: “¿Cómo me morí?” No podía hablar yo con ellos y yo me quedé “XXX, XXX” y nadie me podía escuchar.

Y yo: “¿Qué está pasando?” Y estaba nada más allí, esperando porque nadie me podía ver y luego ya escuché que me morí y yo me quedé: “Ah fuck” (8BS).

8B2: I had a dream just about people dying and I wake up crying. One time I saw myself dead and my spirit was just there crying. I’m going to cry. I don’t know how I died, but I can only say that people did miss me.

8B1: Yes, and why that?

8B2: I don’t know. Now I’m going to cry. It was really emotional for me.

8B1: Yes, you’re crying.

8B2: No, no well I got scared. Θ, “How did I die?” I could not speak with them and I remained, “XXX, XXX” and no one could hear me. And I, “What is going on?” And I was just there, waiting because no one could see me and then I heard that I died and I remained, “Ah fuck” (8BS).

Another example of the use of decir to introduce reported speech and other quotatives for internal monologue is found in (60) in which a female bilingual uses decir
is used to introduce reported speech and *be like* is used to introduce her internal
monologue during the conversation.

(60) Es cuando ella **me dijo**: “Ah, es que se fue desde las diez de la mañana.”

*I’m like*: “OK, ¡qué raro!” entonces **le dije**: “Pero va a regresar porque él
sabe que el domingo su mamá entra el trabajo” (16B2).

*It’s when she said*, “Ah, it’s that he left around ten o’clock this morning.”

*I’m like*: “OK, how strange!” then *I said*: “But he is going to return
because he knows that on Sunday his mom starts work” (16B2).

### 3.7. Discussion

Overall, this qualitative and quantitative analysis of quotatives sheds light on the
permeability of discourse in the speech of these bilinguals. It would be expected that
discourse-pragmatic features would be highly permeable in contact situations because
they appear on the periphery of grammar and are detachable (e.g., Brody, 1987, 1995;
Dajko & Carmichael, 2014). However, contact with English does not appear to radically
influence the use of quotatives in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals.

The most prominent evidence of contact with English in the speech of these
bilinguals is their use of *be like* in Spanish. However, the use of *be like* in Spanish is very
infrequent with only 27 tokens. Moreover, *be like* in Spanish is conditioned significantly
differently than *be like* in English. While *be like* in English significantly favors
introducing reported speech, *be like* in Spanish is primarily used to introduce internal
monologue rather than reported speech. In Spanish, *be like* is also primarily used with
first-person grammatical subjects. The use of *be like* in Spanish is similar to the use of *be
like in English at its first stage of development in which it was used primarily to introduce internal monologue with first-person grammatical subjects (Ferrara & Bell, 1995; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2007)

Regarding the classification of be like in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals as an example of borrowing or code-switching, Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that frequency is the most important factor. While borrowings are frequently used, code-switches may only be used once. The use of be like in Spanish is infrequent but it is used more often than what would be expected for code-switching. Poplack and Sankoff (1984) argue that it is not only frequency of use that can determine if a single word exemplifies code-switching or borrowing, but also several other factors including native language displacement and morphophonemic and syntactic integration. There is no evidence that be like has replaced other quotatives in Spanish, but it appears to have been incorporated in the Spanish quotative system by primarily introducing internal monologue with first-person subjects. This mirrors the first stage of the development of be like in English and does not compete with the linguistic conditioning of decir, which favors reported speech. Several studies have argued that bilingual discourse-pragmatic features should be viewed as both code-switching and borrowings, entering a recipient through code-switching and later becoming established borrowings (Goss & Salmons, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Torres, 2002). The use of be like in Spanish appears to fall somewhere in between code-switching and borrowing, exhibiting more of the characteristics of a borrowing because of its integration into the Spanish quotative system.

The category of quotative discourse markers in the speech of these bilinguals, including the use of como as a quotative, could also be viewed as evidence for contact
with English. Once again, the use of quotative discourse markers was very infrequent with only 38 tokens. Moreover, as Kern (forthcoming) argues, this category of quotatives is conditioned differently than the use of be like in English because it favors introducing internal monologue rather than reported speech. This also reflects the first stage of the grammaticalization of be like, rather than its most recent stage. Lastly, quotative discourse markers have also been found in a non-contact variety in Madrid (Palacios-Martínez, 2013, 2014). Following Poplack and Levey (2010, p. 398), a candidate for a truly contact-induced linguistic change must be absent or conditioned differently in non-contact varieties. Perhaps both the direct borrowing of be like and quotative discourse markers are entering in the Spanish quotative system by introducing internal monologue and are therefore not directly competing with the use of decir. Similarly, Levey et al. (2013) concluded that être comme in Canadian French and be like in English are conditioned differently although content of the quote was not significant in their study.

The differences in the linguistic conditioning of the English and Spanish quotative systems in the speech of the same bilinguals highlight the presence of two distinct systems of quotatives in each language. While be like has replaced the use of say in English and favors introducing reported speech, decir in Spanish is still the most frequently used quotative in Spanish accounting for half of the quotatives in the corpus and favors introducing reported speech. Null quotatives and bare-noun phrases in Spanish appear to also be used to introduce reported speech in addition to decir, but quotative discourse markers and be like appear to favor internal monologue.

There is very little evidence of the displacement of Spanish quotatives in the speech of these bilinguals. Salmons (1990), Torres (2002), and Torres and Potowski
(2008) concluded that discourse markers in English were used at the expense of equivalent discourse markers in minority languages. In the Spanish quotative system of these bilinguals, decir is the preferred variant, mirroring all previous studies of the Spanish quotative systems in both contact (Holguín-Mendoza, 2015; Kern, forthcoming) and non-contact (Cameron, 1998; Palacios-Martínez, 2013, 2014) varieties. Furthermore, there is no evidence of convergence to lessen the cognitive load (Fuller, 2001; Matras, 1998, 2000), fill a gap (Hill & Hill, 1986; Hlavic, 2006) or mark or strengthen discourse boundaries (Dajko & Carmichael, 2014; de Rooij, 2000; Maschler 1994, 1997, 2009).

Finally, the use of *be like* in English appears to have reached an even further stage in its development in the speech of these bilinguals. First, it is highly favored to *say*, accounting for approximately 80% of all quotatives in English while *say* amounts to 18 tokens. Secondly, its linguistic conditioning somewhat conflicts with the constraints of third stage in its development proposed by Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007) which include the favoring the historical present and the first person, the leveling of the content constraint, and a strong female lead. In the present study, *be like* was used most often with the historical present and the first person, but was also used frequently with the past and the third person. Additionally, *be like* significantly favored introducing reported speech and sex was not significant. Perhaps there is a fourth stage in the development of *be like* with the leveling of tense, grammatical person, and sex, and a preference for reported speech.

The analysis of the quotative systems in U.S. English and U.S. Spanish in apparent time is necessary to continue to explore their development. This includes tracking the replacement of *say* in U.S. English and the introduction of quotative
discourse markers and *be like* in U.S. Spanish. Future studies should continue to track the linguistic and social conditioning of quotatives by exploring the next stage of development of *be like* in U.S. English and quotative discourse markers and *be like* in U.S. Spanish. The use of quotative discourse markers and *be like* in U.S. Spanish should especially be analyzed in the future to assess if their relative frequencies increase and if they begin to be used to introduce reported speech at a higher rate.

The results of this study on the linguistic and social conditioning of quotatives in English and Spanish in the speech of the same bilinguals contribute to our knowledge of the limited permeability in discourse in contact situations. In English, *be like* is the preferred variant and significantly introduces reported speech, differing from previous studies. In Spanish, *decir* remains to be the preferred variant, also introducing reported speech. The use of innovative strategies in Spanish including quotative discourse markers and *be like* appears to be entering the Spanish quotative system of these bilinguals by introducing internal monologue, avoiding direct competition with *decir*. These results confirm that the bilinguals of the present study not only have distinct, sophisticated quotative systems in English and Spanish in their linguistic repertoires, but also understand and can reproduce the subtleties of their use.
CHAPTER 4: GENERAL EXTENDERS

4.1. Introduction

General extenders are expressions that consist of a conjunction and a noun phrase that typically occur clause finally in spoken discourse (Cheshire, 2007; Overstreet, 1999; Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010), as shown in (1) and (2)

(1) Yeah, they lost, um, and imagine, like, um, the, the, Valencia players were all like high-fiving like, like hugging and shit. And then, um, Neymar goes up to like group- uh, two that were hugging, and he just goes up and like bitch slaps the fuck- bitch-slaps his face and walks off. And they’re like, “Aw, what the fuck?” And then the guy’s like, “Aw, what the fuck? Like, “Sore-ass loser!” He’s like, “Yeah, I’m ten times the player you are!” And he just goes and he like grabs a water bottle and starts throwing it at him and shit (7B2).

(2) Estaba saliendo con una muchacha de allí de XXX pero era bonita, era inteligente, era muy buena y todo. Pero era demasiado así de esas que se creen muy maduras, era demasiado estricta y todo eso (7B1).

He was going out with a girl from there from XXX, but she was pretty, she was smart, she was hot and all. But she was too much like those (girls) that think they are really mature, she was too strict and all that (7B1).

General extenders in English have been extensively studied under the guise of many different labels including general extenders (Cheshire, 2007; Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010; Wagner et al., 2015), approximation markers (Erman, 1995), discourse extenders (Norrby & Winter, 2002), extension particles (Dubois, 1992), generalized list completers
(Jefferson, 1991; Lerner, 1994), lexical bundles (Biber et al., 2004), set-marking tags (Dines, 1980; Ward & Birner, 1993), vague category identifiers (Channell, 1994) and many more. General extenders in English have been studied in the United States (Overstreet, 1999; Overstreet & Yule, 1997, 2002), Canada (Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010), England (Aijmer, 2002; Cheshire, 2007; Pichler & Levey, 2011), Ireland (O’Keeffe, 2004), Scotland (Macaulay, 1991), Australia (Dines, 1980; Norrby & Winter, 2002) and New Zealand (Stubbe & Holmes, 1995; Terraschke, 2007). Studies of general extenders in Spanish have only analyzed their use in Peninsular Spanish (Alvarado Ortega, 2008; Cortés, 2005, 2006a, 2006b; Fernández, 2015; Gille, 2006; Gille & Häggkvist, 2006, 2010). General extenders have also been studied in French (Secova, 2014), German (Overstreet, 2005; Terraschke, 2007), and Persian (Parvaresh et al., 2012).

This chapter analyzes the use of general extenders in English and Spanish among the same bilinguals in Southern Arizona and the similarities and differences in their linguistic and social conditioning within and between languages. It begins by discussing the grammaticalization of general extenders. This is followed by circumscribing the variable contexts of general extenders in both languages. Finally, the analysis of the linguistic and social conditioning of general extenders in the present corpora in English and Spanish comprised of the speech of the same bilinguals is presented and discussed.

4.2. Grammaticalization of General Extenders

Discussions of the possible grammaticalization of general extenders are two-fold, pertaining to both an increase in pragmatic function and the reduction of form. Regarding
the increase in pragmatic function, general extenders prototypically fulfill a referential function of extending an inferable set (Wagner et al., 2015, p. 707). However, general extenders have also been found to be used to fulfill other non-referential pragmatic functions including hedging the quality or accuracy of information and marking positive or negative politeness (Fernandez & Yuldashev, 2011; Fernández, 2015; Overstreet, 1999, 2014). Cheshire (2007) argues that the properties of grammaticalization of decategorization and the bleaching of morphosyntactic properties is reflected in the use of general extenders non-referentially, that is, without any possible inferable set. The implication here is that the non-referential functions of general extenders are more grammaticalized than referential functions.

The reduction of form, another characteristic of grammaticalization, has been found to correspond with the increase of pragmatic function. Wagner et al. (2015) concluded that general extenders that fulfilled referential functions were longer in form (three or more morphemes) than general extenders that fulfilled non-referential functions. Cheshire (2007) argues that shorter forms and that, and everything, and or something are more grammaticalized than the longer forms such as and stuff like that, or something like that, and and everything like that.

It is important to note that some studies of general extenders have not found evidence of grammaticalization. Notably, Pichler and Levey (2011) did not find evidence of systematic changes in form or function in the use of general extenders and therefore question their grammaticalization. The present study explores the forms and functions of general extenders in the present corpora in English and Spanish comprised of speech from the same Spanish-English bilinguals in order to assess their use in each language
and the permeability of discourse in the speech of the same bilinguals. The following section circumscribes the variable context of general extenders in English and Spanish.

### 4.3. Circumscribing the Variable Context of General Extenders

The variable contexts of general extenders in English and Spanish are circumscribed by their forms and functions and exploring the extralinguistic factors that influence their use. Tagliamonte & Denis (2010) describe the prototypical general extender form in English, consisting of a connector (and, or), quantifier (all, every, some, any, the odd, the whole, no), generic (thing(s), stuff, people, one, where, shit, crap, baloney), and a comparative (like that, sort of, kind of, type of, of that kind, of that sort, of that type, around there, to that effect) (pp. 336-337). According to Tagliamonte & Denis (2010), a connector is required, a quantifier and/or a generic is required, and a comparative is optional (p. 336).

The authors outline five distinct patterns of general extenders: 1. Connector + generic + comparative (and stuff like that); 2. Connector + quantifier + generic + comparative (and everything like that); 3. Connector + generic (and things), 4. Connector + quantifier + generic (or something); and 5. fixed expressions (or whatever) (Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010, p. 337). Overstreet & Yule (1997) denote general extenders that begin with and as “adjunctive” and those that begin with or as “disjunctive.” Since adjunctive and disjunctive general extenders, do not function uniformly and have different distributions across varieties, Cheshire (2007) argues that they should be analyzed separately (p. 187).

Regarding the most frequent forms of general extenders, and stuff is the most common form in Canadian English (Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010; Wagner et al., 2015) and has been found to be increasing in British English (Cheshire, 2007; Pichler & Levey,
In American English, Overstreet & Yule (1997) concluded that the most frequent general extender in their corpus was *or something* followed by *and stuff*. Wagner et al. (2015) found that *and stuff* (17.5%) was the most frequent general extender in the Fisher corpus of telephone conversations of American English, followed by *or something* (16.6%) In the LDS corpus of sociolinguistic interviews in American English also analyzed by Wagner et al. (2015), the general extender *and everything* (21.8%) was the most frequent variant followed by *and things like that* (16.2%).

In Peninsular Spanish, Cortés (2006a, 2006b) outlines four categories of forms of general extenders. The first of these categories corresponds to adjunctive general extenders beginning with the conjunction *y* (*and*). The second category corresponds to disjunctive general extenders beginning with the conjunction *o* (*or*). According to Cortés (2006b), a third category of general extenders includes expressions beginning with *ni* (*nor*) including *ni nada* (*not anything*), *ni eso* (*not even that*), and a fourth category of general extenders includes expressions without a conjunction including *cosas así* (*stuff like that*) and *todo eso* (*all of that*). Fernández (2015) re-frames these four categories as two categories of adjunctive or disjunctive general extenders. First, she classifies adjunctive general extenders as affirmative with *y* or negative with *ni* to take into account Cortés’s (2006b) category of general extenders that begin with *ni*. Secondly, in order to take into account Cortés’s (2006b) category of general extenders without a conjunction, Fernández (2015) argues that both adjunctive and disjunctive general extenders can be “reduced” in cases in which the “conjunction does not surface lexically” (p. 4). The general extenders in Cortés’s (2006b) and Fernández’s (2015) correspond to what Gille (2006, p. 159) and Gille and Häggkvist (2006) denote as “apéndices de categorización
generalizada” which they group with four other categories of “apéndices conversacionales” on the right periphery including “creo yo,” “¿sabes?,” “por decirlo así,” and “pues” (pp. 65-66) Alvarado Ortega (2008) denotes these expressions as “fórmulas rutinarias de transición” (p. 394).

Regarding the most frequent forms of general extenders in peninsular Spanish, Cortés (2006b) concluded that the most commonly used general extenders in a corpus of sociolinguistic interviews from Almería (El corpus del habla de Almería) were etcétera (etcetera), y todo eso (and all that) and y eso (and that). The most frequent general extender in Fernández’s (2015) study of part of the COREC corpus of Peninsular Spanish was y tal (224/738), followed by y eso (96/738) and y todo (56/738). All of these general extenders are adjunctive, beginning with the conjunction y.

The forms of general extenders were identified in the present corpora in English and Spanish by their required generics. The generics of general extenders in English include stuff, thing, things, shit, that, and whatever, whereas the generics of general extenders in Spanish include todo, así, cosas, eso, and algo. Similar to the variables in other chapters, general extenders within direct quotation were eliminated in both English (3) and Spanish (4), but extensions of direct quotations were included in both languages as shown in (5) and (6).

(3) Before Stewie leaves, he’s like, saying to Rupert, to Rupert, he’s like, “Oh yeah, honey. I’ll be back shortly. Like, do you want anything on the way back? Do you want lunch or something like that?” (7B1).

(4) Le dije: “¿Nunca te ha regañado a ti? ¿Nunca se te hecho encima de una manera por lo que hayas dicho o hecho o algo así?” (5B2).
I said to him: “He has never scolded you? He has never scolded you for something you have said or done or something like that?” (5B2).

I hate shrimp. Dude, I will never taste shrimp in my life. I tasted it once, ‘cause XXX’s like, “Oh, fish. Oh, shrimp’s so good” and whatnot (7B1).

Dijo o sea: “Tengo como, tomo seis clases, luego trabajo. No me queda tiempo para nada” y así (5B1).

He said or rather: “I have like, I take six clases, then I work. I don’t have time for anything” and so (5B1).

Regarding their functions, general extenders prototypically fulfill a referential function of extending an inferable set (Wagner et al., 2015, p. 707). Adjunctive general extenders have been documented to express the possible existence of more possibilities whereas disjunctive general extenders have been found signal other possibilities in both English (Overstreet, 1999, 2014) and Spanish (Fernández, 2015). General extenders can also fulfill non-referential pragmatic functions in both languages. Adjunctive general extenders can hedge the quality of information and mark positive politeness by signaling common ground whereas disjunctive general extenders can hedge the accuracy of information and mark negative politeness through the avoidance of imposing on the interlocutor (Fernández, 2015; Overstreet, 2014). Aijmer (1985) proposes functional schema associated with specific forms of general extenders with “and-tags” or adjunctive general extenders associated with additive set marking, discourse-structuring, fumbling, creating rapport, establishing common ground, add foregrounding and “or-tags” or disjunctive general extenders associated with alternative set marking, hedging, softening, and approximation (p. 378). Non-referential, interpersonal functions are often
overlapping and Cheshire (2007) argues that one function should not be prioritized over another. Doing so “overlooks the flexibility and multifunctionality that is the most salient characteristic of these linguistic forms (p. 158). Picher and Levey (2011) establish four stages of functions: Stage 0: Set marking; Stage 1: Set marking and interpersonal/textual; Stage 2: Interpersonal/textual; and Stage 3: Devoid of referential/pragmatic meanings (p. 452).

Wagner et al. create a set of criteria for identifying referential general extenders and separating them from general extenders that fulfill non-referential functions. Following Wagner et al. (2015), referential functions were isolated from non-referential functions through the following criteria for which referents “can unambiguously be located” (p. 711). In English, general extenders were classified as referential if there were two or more referents within the prepositional phrase or the tensed phrase in which the general extender was present or within the discourse context defined by Wagner et al. (2015) as the speaker turn, as shown in (7):

(7) But with guys it’s like they reinforce the math and science but they won’t reinforce like good like English skills and good like art skills and things like that (12B2).

It could be assumed that plural generics such as things (7) would automatically fulfill a referential function, but this was not always the case. In (8), the use of the general extender and things like that does not fulfill a referential function. Consequently, the use of plural generics was not used as a criterion for determining if a referential discourse function was fulfilled or not.

(8) We were gonna hang out over winter break, but that’s when the shop is
like the busiest obviously cuz it’s like, Christmas and things like that (16B1).

However, the qualitative analysis of the present study did reveal that the discourse context for determining possible referents of general extenders should be expanded to the entire discourse, that is, the entire conversation. In (9), 16B1 later mentions the second required referent of the general extender and stuff after his friend questions him about it. The general extender and stuff in this example was classified as referential.

(9) 16B1: I’m gonna have to go back, and look through all like, my stuff.

16B2: Your pictures?

16B1: My pictures and stuff.

16B2: Or do you have a diary that says it all.

16B1: Maybe.

16B2: ((laughs)) Do you really?

16B1: It’s a journal, ok? (16BE).

In (10), the general extender and everything is referentially extending the referents provided by the other interlocutor for the reasons why he likes his new job.

(10) 5B2: Yeah. It’s, it’s easy, it’s here on campus

5B1: Mhm.

5B2: So I don’t have to be moving around all the time or anything.

5B1: Yeah.

5B2: I don’t have to spend so much gas.

5B1: And they work with your class schedule and everything, right?

5B2: Yeah.
5B1: Yeah, that’s why I like working here, too (5BE).

In (11), the general extender *and all those things* is interpreted by the interlocutor as referential who adds another referent. These same referents were referred to later on in the conversation with another general extender *and stuff*. Both of these general extenders were classified as referential.

(11)  5B2: Hmm. I feel like the, like, if by feeling peer pressure, I guess, you know in high school, like those, it’s like those kinda times where like some students or kids start like smoking weed *and all those things*.

5B1: Yeah, *drinking* (5)

(…)  

5B2: You still might have those friends that smoke weed *and stuff* but they, they don’t really peer pressure anyone (5BE)

Nevertheless, there were still contexts that were ambiguous, as shown in (12). If the general extender *and stuff* refers to the actions of sitting down and listening to his albums, the function would be classified as referential. However, it is not clear if these are referents of the general extender according to the discourse context. This token was therefore classified as non-referential.

(12)  I like the music I’ve heard, but it’s not like I’ve sat down and listened to his albums *and stuff* (15B2).

Non-referential functions will not be explored here. It is clear from the data that general extenders have become semantically bleached and therefore are extremely hard to classify according to pragmatic function, as shown in (13), which does not have a discernable pragmatic function.
They’re like Irish and shit, so they’re just totally like family oriented (17B1).

In Spanish, the same criterion was followed to isolate general extenders that fulfilled referential functions from those that fulfilled non-referential functions. Tokens of general extenders were classified as referential if there were two or more referents within the entire conversation, as shown in (14)

(14) Una vez estábamos manejando mi- mi toda mi familia en- de XXX a XXX y empezó a llover súper fuerte y así tanto que el carro se movía con el viento, y todas las parabrisas llenas de agua y todo y así mi papá siguió manejando (3B1).

One time we were driving, me- all of my family from XXX to XXX and it began to rain really strongly so that the car moved with the wind, and the windshield full of water and all and like this my dad kept driving (3B1).

The Spanish data presented one exceptional case in which only one referent was provided, but it was clear from the immediate context that two or more referents were implied. In (15), the use of the plural “cosas” before “de Bate Papo” implies more than one referent even though only one referent was provided. The general extender y esas cosas in this example was classified as referential.

(15) Y en otra cosa en la página de Facebook de la del Departamento de Español y Portugués cuando ponen cosas de Bate Papo y esas cosas, pusieron un artículo de que Google está contratando a gente que hablara portugués para mandarlas a Irlanda, a Nueva York y no sé qué otro país (12B2).
And in another thing in the Facebook Page of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese when they put things about Bate Papo and these things, they put an article that Google was hiring people who speak Portuguese to send them to Ireland, to New York and I don’t know what other country (12B2).

The same situation occurs in (16) in which the plural memes implies multiple referents and the general extender y cosas así was classified as referential.

(16) 5B1: Fiesta de divorcio ((risas))

5B2: Haz de cuenta que imprimí unos memes.

5B1: Sí

5B2: así de soltería y cosas así (5BS).

5B1: Divorce party ((laugh))

5B2: Realize that I printed some memes.

5B1: Yes

5B2: about being single and things like that (5BS).

In (17), the use of mucho before the como of exemplification also indicates more than one referent even though only one referent is provided. The general extender y todo eso in this example was classified as referential.

(17) Me dieron mucho como las barbies y todo eso (15B2).

They gave me a lot like Barbies and all that (15B2).

Finally, the use of general extenders has been explored according to extralinguistic factors in English, but not in Spanish. Several studies have found correlations between the use of general extenders and age, with younger speakers using
general extenders more frequently than older speakers (Dubois, 1992; Pichler & Levey, 2011; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995; Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010). Sex has not been found as an important extralinguistic factor in general extender use (Cheshire, 2007; Norrby & Winter 2002; Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010) with the exception of Britain (1992), who found that women use general extenders more than men, Stubbe & Holmes (1995), who found that young middle-class women and young working-class men used general extenders more than other groups, and Pichler & Levey (2011), who concluded that younger males have an elevated rate of general extender use.

4.4. Research Questions

This chapter analyzes the linguistic and social conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish among bilinguals from Southern Arizona in order to assess the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals. The following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the relative frequencies of general extenders in English and Spanish?

2. What are the types of general extenders used in English and Spanish and what is the distribution of adjunctive and disjunctive general extenders in both languages?

3. What are the similarities and differences in the linguistic conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish? What is the distribution of referential and non-referential functions of general extenders in both
languages? What are the formal characteristics of referential general extenders?

4. Are sex and language dominance significant in the relative frequencies of general extenders and/or their linguistic conditioning in English and Spanish?

This study builds on previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations that have widely ignored the donor language by analyzing the linguistic and social conditioning of general extenders in both English and Spanish in the speech of the same bilinguals. This is the first study known to the investigator to analyze the use of general extenders in a contact situation. The analysis of the linguistic and social conditioning of the use of discourse-pragmatic features in English and Spanish corpora comprised of data from the same Spanish-English bilinguals allows for the permeability of discourse in the speech of the same bilinguals to be assessed.

4.5. Methods of Data Analysis

The qualitative and quantitative analysis of social and linguistic conditioning of general extenders in the speech of the bilinguals in the present study includes 325 tokens of general extenders from eighteen hours of recorded conversations, nine hours in each language. The frequency of general extenders in both languages per 10,000 words was calculated for each participant to give an overall view of their use. These frequencies were calculated by dividing the total number of tokens of general extenders for each participant by each participant’s overall word count in each language and multiplying by 10,000. The transcription conventions that led to overall word counts are discussed in Chapter 1. Next, the forms and functions of general extenders were analyzed to explore their linguistic conditioning. A linear mixed-effects model was run to assess the
significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of general extenders. Another linear mixed-effects model was run to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the percent use of general extenders to fulfill referential functions. A logistic mixed-effects model was run to assess the significance of language in the length of general extenders. Lastly, another logistic mixed-effects model was run to assess the significance of length in the use of general extenders to fulfill referential or non-referential functions. All of these models were run with random intercepts for each participant to take into account participant variation.

4.6. Analysis

The following analysis explores the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals by assessing the linguistic and social conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish. The participants are equally divided by sex and dominance with an average language dominance score of 3.20 (5.06 for male participants and 1.34 for female participants). The analysis begins by exploring the frequencies of general extenders in English and Spanish in the present corpus, which are represented in Table 4.1. In Table 4.1, participants are divided by sex and arranged from most Spanish dominant to most English dominant. The participants’ numbers correspond to pairs.

<p>| Table 4.1: Frequency of General Extenders in Spanish and English per 10,000 Words According to Participant, Sex, and Language Dominance |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <strong>Participant</strong> | <strong>General Extenders in English</strong> | <strong>General Extenders in Spanish</strong> |
| Female Bilinguals | | |
| 5B1 F | 19.89 | 28.66 |
| 12B2 F | 30.40 | 30.07 |
| 3B2 F | 3.71 | 7.37 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B1 F</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B2 F</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B2 F</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2 F</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>27.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B2 F</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Male Bilinguals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5B2 M</td>
<td>70.53</td>
<td>41.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B1 M</td>
<td>39.21</td>
<td>16.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B1 M</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B2 M</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>58.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1 M</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>36.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B1 M</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B1 M</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>24.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B1 M</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B1 M</td>
<td>39.40</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Overall Average** | **22.35** | **19.76** |

This table is presented visually in Figure 4.1, with each point corresponding to a participant.

**Figure 4.1: Frequency of General Extenders in Spanish and English per 10,000 Words According to Participant, Sex, and Language Dominance**

As shown in Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1, the frequencies of general extenders in English and Spanish were similar at the group level and the individual level. A linear
mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the frequency of use of general extenders. There were no main effects or interactions ($p > 0.05$), meaning that language, sex, and dominance were not significant. These results suggest that the frequencies of general extenders in English and Spanish are similar regardless of sex and dominance.

Now that the frequencies of general extenders in English and Spanish have been explored, let’s turn to the forms of general extenders, which are in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: Forms of General Extenders in English and Spanish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Extenders in English</th>
<th>General Extenders in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjunctive GEs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adjunctive GEs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>and STUFF</em></td>
<td><em>y todo (eso)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.81% (57/185)</td>
<td>49.29% (69/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>and everything (like that)</em></td>
<td><em>y así</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.59% (27/185)</td>
<td>10% (14/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>and THINGS</em></td>
<td><em>y COSAS</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.86% (9/185)</td>
<td>7.86% (11/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>and shit</em></td>
<td><em>y eso</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.86% (9/185)</td>
<td>2.86% (4/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(all) that</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.08% (2/185)</td>
<td>Other Adjunctive GEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Adjunctive GEs</td>
<td>1.43% (2/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62% (3/185)</td>
<td>Adjunctive GEs Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.84% (107/185)</td>
<td>70.71% (99/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disjunctive GEs Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.54% (75/185)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disjunctive GEs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>or something (like that)</em></td>
<td><em>o algo (asi)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.12% (52/185)</td>
<td>16.43% (23/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>or anything</em></td>
<td><em>o cosas asi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.57% (14/185)</td>
<td>2.14% (3/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>or whatever</em></td>
<td>Other Disjunctive GEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.78% (7/185)</td>
<td>1.43% (2/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Disjunctive GEs</td>
<td>Disjunctive GEs Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.08% (2/185)</td>
<td>20% (28/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disjunctive GEs Total</strong></td>
<td>Other GEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.54% (75/185)</td>
<td><em>algo así</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other GEs</td>
<td>5.71% (8/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>this and that</em></td>
<td><em>algo así</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62% (3/185)</td>
<td>todo eso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other GEs Total</td>
<td>Other GEs Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62% (3/185)</td>
<td>8.57% (12/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall GEs</td>
<td>Overall GEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (185/185)</td>
<td>100% (140/140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, adjunctive general extenders beginning with *and* (57.84%; 107/185) were more frequent than disjunctive general extenders beginning with *or* (40.54%; 75/185). The most frequent adjunctive general extender was *and STUFF* (30.81%; 57/185). The *and STUFF* variants include fifty-one tokens of *and stuff*, four tokens of *and stuff like that*, and one token each of *and a lot of stuff* and *and a bunch of other stuff*. This
was followed by and *everything (like that)* (14.59%; 27/185), *and THINGS* (4.86%; 9/185), *and shit* (4.86%; 9/185), and *and (all) that* (1.08%; 2/185). The *and THINGS* variants include six tokens of *and things like that* and one token each of *and all these things* and *and all those things*. The other adjunctive general extenders in English include one token each of *and this and that*, *and whatever*, and *and whatnot*. The most frequent disjunctive general extender in English was *or something (like that)* (28.12%; 52/185). This was followed by *or anything* (7.57%; 14/185), and *or whatever* (3.78%; 7/185). Other disjunctive general extenders in English include *or shit like that* and *or someplace like that*. The Other GEs category in English includes three tokens of *this and that* without a conjunction.

The most frequent forms of English general extenders in the present study, *and stuff* (30.81%; 57/185), *or something (like that)* (28.12%; 52/185), and *and everything (like that)* (14.59%; 27/185) were also found to be highly frequent in other corpora of American English. The general extender *and stuff* (17.5%) was the most frequent general extender in the Fisher corpus of telephone conversations analyzed by Wagner et al. (2015) followed by *or something* (16.6%). The general extender *and everything* (6.3%) was the fourth most frequent variant. In the LDS corpus of sociolinguistic interviews in American English analyzed by Wagner et al. (2015), *and everything* (21.8%) was the most frequent variant, *or something* (13.4%) was the third most frequent variant and *and stuff like that* (8.6%) was the fifth most frequent variant. The general extenders *or something* and *and stuff* respectively were also the most frequent variants of general extenders in Overstreet and Yule’s (1997) study.
In Spanish, adjunctive general extenders beginning with *y* (70.71%; 99/140) were also more frequent than disjunctive general extenders beginning with *o* (20%; 28/140). The most frequent adjunctive general extender was *y todo (eso)* (49.29%; 69/140), followed by *y así* (10%; 14/140), *y COSAS* (7.86%; 11/140), and *y eso* (2.86%; 4/140). The *y COSAS* variants included three tokens of *y cosas así* and one token each of *y asi cosas, y otras cosas, y toda la cosa, y esas cosas, y pues cosas así, y no sé así un chorro de cosas, y todas esas cosas, and y todas esas cosas así*. The other adjunctive general extenders in Spanish were one token each of *y todo así* and *etcetera*. The most frequent disjunctive general extender was *o algo así* (16.43%; 23/140), followed by *o cosas así* (2.14%; 3/140). The other disjunctive general extenders include one token each of *o asi* and *o todo eso*. The Other GEs category in Spanish includes *algo así* (5.71%; 8/140) and *todo eso* (1.43%; 2/140) without a conjunction. The other general extenders in this category include one token each of *todo ese rollo* and *cosas así*. Overall, the most frequent forms of general extenders in Spanish were *y todo (eso), o algo (así)* and *y así*. This is the first study known to the investigator of general extenders in U.S. Spanish so comparisons across dialects of U.S. Spanish cannot be made.

Another characteristic of the forms of general extenders is their length, which was classified as long if they consisted of three words or more and short if they consisted of fewer than three words. The length of general extenders in English and Spanish is found in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>General Extenders in English</th>
<th>General Extenders in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>18.92% (35/185)</td>
<td>34.29% (48/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>81.08% (150/185)</td>
<td>65.71% (92/140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A logistic mixed-effects model was carried out to assess if language, language dominance, and sex were significant in the length of general extenders. There was a main effect of language ($\chi^2(1) = 10.26; p < 0.05$) and sex and dominance were not significant. This means that general extenders in Spanish are significantly longer than general extenders in English regardless of sex and dominance. If shorter general extenders are seen as more grammaticalized than longer general extenders (Cheshire, 2007), this result suggests that general extenders in English may be more grammaticalized than general extenders in Spanish.

The analysis continues by exploring the functions of general extenders. The distribution of general extenders in English and Spanish according to referential and non-referential functions according to each participant is presented in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4: Distribution of Referential and Non-Referential Functions of General Extenders in English and Spanish According to Participant, Sex, and Language Dominance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>General Extenders in English</th>
<th>General Extenders in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referential</td>
<td>Non-Referential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B1 F</td>
<td>33.33% (1/3)</td>
<td>66.67% (2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B2 F</td>
<td>35.29% (6/17)</td>
<td>64.71% (11/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2 F</td>
<td>100% (1/1)</td>
<td>0% (0/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B1 F</td>
<td>40% (2/5)</td>
<td>60% (3/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B2 F</td>
<td>6.25% (1/16)</td>
<td>93.75% (15/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B2 F</td>
<td>0% (0/1)</td>
<td>100% (1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B2 F</td>
<td>50% (2/4)</td>
<td>50% (2/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2 F</td>
<td>22.22% (2/9)</td>
<td>77.78% (7/9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B2 F</td>
<td>9.09% (1/11)</td>
<td>90.91% (10/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Female</td>
<td>21.54% (14/65)</td>
<td>78.46% (51/65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B2 M</td>
<td>54.76% (23/42)</td>
<td>45.24% (19/42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B1 M</td>
<td>37.5% (6/16)</td>
<td>62.5% (10/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B1 M</td>
<td>33.33% (1/3)</td>
<td>66.67% (2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B2 M</td>
<td>42.86% (6/14)</td>
<td>57.14% (8/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1 M</td>
<td>50% (3/6)</td>
<td>50% (3/6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2 illustrates the percent of use of general extenders in English and Spanish to fulfill non-referential functions according to participant, sex, and language dominance.

A linear mixed-effects model was carried out to assess the significance of language, language dominance, and sex in the linguistic conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish with the percentage of the use of each variant to fulfill referential functions as the dependent variable. The model was run with random intercepts for each participant to take into account variation among participants. There was a main effect of language ($\chi^2(1)=3.94 \ p< 0.05$) and sex and dominance were not
significant. This means that general extenders were used to fulfill referential functions significantly more often in Spanish than in English regardless of sex and dominance. If non-referential functions of general extenders are a sign of grammaticalization (Cheshire, 2007), it seems once again that general extenders in English are more grammaticalized than general extenders in Spanish because they are more often used to fulfill non-referential functions. This main effect is illustrated in Figure 4.3.

**Figure 4.3: Main Effect of Language in Use of General extenders to Fulfill Referential functions**

Finally, Wagner et al.’s (2015) finding that referential general extenders were longer than non-referential general extenders was explored with this data. A logistic mixed-effects model was carried out to assess if length and language were predictors in the use of referential functions. There was a main effect of length ($\chi(1)= 21.76; p < 0.05$) and no interaction with language, meaning that in both English and Spanish length is significant in determining whether a general extender fulfills a referential function.
Referential general extenders are indeed longer than non-referential general extenders in both languages. Figure 4.4 illustrates the main effect of length in the use of referential general extenders in English and Spanish.

**Figure 4.4: Main Effect of Length in the Use of Referential General Extenders in English and Spanish**

4.7. Discussion

Overall, this qualitative and quantitative analysis of general extenders sheds light on the permeability of discourse in the speech of these bilinguals. It would be expected that discourse-pragmatic features would be highly permeable in contact situations because they appear on the periphery of grammar and are detachable (e.g., Brody, 1987, 1995; Dajko & Carmichael, 2014). However, contact with English does not appear to radically influence the use general extenders in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals.
There is no evidence of the borrowing of form or function in the use of general extenders in the speech of these bilinguals. There were no English forms of general extenders in Spanish as seen with the use of *like* and *be like* in Spanish in previous chapters. There is also no evidence of the borrowing of function since general extenders in Spanish are used to fulfill referential functions significantly more often than general extenders in English. This leads to the conclusion that there is no evidence of displacement of general extenders in Spanish, as Salmons (1990), Torres (2002), and Torres and Potowski (2008) found regarding the use of discourse markers in contact situations. Moreover, there is no evidence of convergence to lessen the cognitive load (Fuller, 2001; Matras, 1998, 2000), fill a gap (Hill & Hill, 1986; Hlavic, 2006) or mark or strengthen discourse boundaries (Dajko & Carmichael, 2014; de Rooij, 2000; Maschler 1994; 1997, 2009).

The analysis depicts two systems of general extenders in English and Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals that show differences in their linguistic conditioning in both form and function without differences in their social conditioning. General extenders in Spanish are significantly longer than general extenders in English regardless of sex and dominance. Moreover, general extenders in Spanish are used to fulfill referential functions significantly more often than general extenders in English regardless of sex and dominance. It is only by analyzing the use of general extenders in both English and Spanish in the speech of the same bilinguals that these differences can be assessed.

The differences in the linguistic conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals could indicate different stages their development in each language. As discussed previously, the grammaticalization of general extenders is
two-fold corresponding to both a reduction of form and an increase in pragmatic function (Cheshire, 2007; Wagner et al., 2015). Since general extenders in English are both shorter and used to fulfill non-referential functions at a higher rate, general extenders may be at a more advanced stage of development in English than in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals. Furthermore, in both English and Spanish, Wagner et al.’s (2015) hypothesis regarding the relationship between form and function holds. Referential general extenders are significantly longer than non-referential extenders in both languages, providing evidence of a linguistic constraint that connects both form and function.

The analysis of general extenders in apparent time in U.S. English and U.S. Spanish is necessary to continue to explore this hypothesis of their different stages of development in each language. This includes tracking both the length of general extenders and the percent use of general extenders to fulfill referential functions in both languages. In apparent time, this hypothesis regarding the grammaticalization of general extenders would predict that both their length and their percent use to fulfill referential functions would decrease.

Future studies should also assess the length of general extenders and their distribution of referential and non-referential functions in monolingual Spanish varieties to compare with the forms and functions of general extenders in the speech of these Spanish-English bilinguals. This analysis could reveal the internal linguistic constraints guiding the use of general extenders in Spanish that have not been identified. It would be especially important to explore whether referential general extenders are longer than non-referential general extenders in monolingual Spanish to confirm the findings of Wagner
et al. (2015) for English and the results of the present study of the use of general extenders in both English and Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals.

For now, the results of this study demonstrate significant differences in the linguistic conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish in the speech of the same bilinguals. General extenders in Spanish are longer and are used to fulfill referential functions at a higher rate than general extenders in English. At the same time, referential general extenders in both languages are longer than non-referential extenders, suggesting the existence of a linguistic constraint that connects both form and function. These results contribute to our limited knowledge of the use of general extenders in Spanish and their use in contact situations.
CHAPTER 5: CONTRIBUTIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL APPLICATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This dissertation has analyzed the permeability of discourse in the speech of eighteen Spanish-English bilinguals from Southern Arizona. In doing so, the linguistic and social conditioning of three discourse-pragmatic features that are prominent in both languages was assessed, each corresponding to a chapter of the dissertation. These discourse-pragmatic features include the discourse marker *like* in English and its equivalents *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish, quotatives, and general extenders. It was expected that discourse-pragmatic features would be highly permeable in contact situations because they appear on the periphery of grammar and are detachable (e.g., Brody, 1987, 1995; Dajko & Carmichael, 2014). However, contact with English did not radically influence the use of any of these discourse-pragmatic features in the Spanish of these bilinguals. This concluding chapter will begin with a summary of results. This will be followed by exploring the application of these results in pedagogical contexts. Finally, the contributions of this dissertation to the field and future directions for research will be discussed.

5.2. Summary of Results

Each chapter of this dissertation has explored the linguistic and social conditioning of a discourse pragmatic feature including the discourse marker *like* in English and its equivalents *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish, quotatives, and general extenders. Regarding the linguistic and social conditioning of the discourse marker *like* in English and its equivalents *como, como que*, and *like* in Spanish, the use of *like* in
English was significantly more frequent than the use of *como, como que,* and *like* in Spanish, regardless of sex and dominance. The overall distribution of the use *like* in English as a discourse marker and discourse particle compared with the overall distribution of *como que* and *like* in Spanish was significantly different, suggesting the *like* in English is conditioned differently than *como que* and *like* in Spanish. The overall distribution of the use *like* in English as a discourse marker and discourse particle compared with the overall distribution of *como* in Spanish was not significantly different. However, the percent use of *como* in Spanish as a discourse particle is significantly higher among Spanish dominant bilinguals regardless of sex, suggesting the ability to use *como* inside of the clause is sign of Spanish dominance. As discourse markers, *like* in English and the three Spanish variants were conditioned similarly, but *like* English was used to modify subordinate clauses while the Spanish variants only appeared before matrix clauses. As discourse particles, *like* in English was more widespread and occurred in many more distinct syntactic positions than each of the three Spanish variants.

Contact with *like* in English does not radically influence the use of *como, como que* and *like* in Spanish. The most prominent evidence of contact with English was the use of *like* in Spanish; however, *like* in Spanish was significantly less frequent and was conditioned significantly differently than *like* in English. It has not been incorporated in Spanish syntax as a discourse particle. Although *como* and *como que* could also be viewed as the result of contact with English, they are also relatively infrequent in Spanish in comparison to *like* in English, confirming the results of Jørgensen & Stenström (2009) who analyzed the use of the discursive *como* in Madrid Spanish and the use of *like* in British English in conversations between monolingual teenagers. The use of *como* in a
non-contact variety in Madrid suggests that it is not the result of contact, in line with Poplack and Levey (2010) who argue that a candidate for a truly contact-induced linguistic change must be absent or conditioned differently in non-contact varieties (p. 398). Furthermore, the linguistic conditioning of *como* and *como que* in Spanish which differs from the linguistic conditioning of like in English in the speech of the same bilinguals also suggests that contact with like in English does not radically influence their use.

The differences in the linguistic conditioning of *like* in English and *como*, *como que*, and *like* in Spanish suggests that these four variants are at different stages in their development. The use of *like* in English in the present study is at this most advanced stage because it occurs frequently as both a discourse marker and a discourse particle and its use is widespread in terms of the syntactic positions in which it can appear, including the verbal domain. The use of *como* in Spanish appears to lag just behind the use of *like* in English, occurring less frequently as both a discourse marker and a discourse particle and occurring in fewer syntactic positions, most often appearing the determiner phrase. The use of *como que* in Spanish is next in line in terms of its development because it is used relatively infrequently and almost exclusively as a discourse marker rather than a discourse particle. Lastly, *like* in Spanish is at an initial stage in its development. It is used relatively infrequently and is only used as a discourse marker.

Regarding the linguistic and social conditioning of quotatives, the frequency of quotatives in both English and Spanish was approximately the same. The frequency of quotatives by male bilinguals in both languages decreased as English dominance increased. The frequency of quotatives by female bilinguals in English increased as their
English dominance increased, but there is no correlation between frequency of quotatives in Spanish and language dominance. The most frequent quotative in English was *be like*, distantly followed by null quotatives and *like* without *be*. In English, *be like* was used most frequently with the historical present and the past. It was used with both the first-person and the third-person. It was used most often by female bilinguals. It significantly favors introducing reported speech. In Spanish, the most frequent quotative was *decir*, followed by null quotatives, bare-noun phrases, and quotative discourse markers. In Spanish, *decir* was used most frequently with the preterite tense. It was used approximately equally with the first-person and the third-person. It was also used more frequently by male bilinguals. It significantly favors introducing reported speech.

Regarding other frequently used quotatives in Spanish, null quotatives were used most frequently to introduce reported speech, bare-noun phrases were used most often with the first-person and to reported speech, and quotative discourse markers favored internal monologue.

Contact with English does not appear to radically influence the use of quotatives in Spanish. The most prominent evidence of contact with English in the use of quotatives in Spanish is 27 tokens of *be like* in Spanish. However, the use of *be like* in Spanish appears to be conditioned differently than *be like* in English. While *be like* in English is used approximately equally with both first and third person grammatical subjects, *be like* in Spanish is used primarily with first-person grammatical subjects. Moreover, while *be like* in English favors the introducing of reported Spanish, *be like* in Spanish is more often used to introduce internal monologue and *decir* is used for reported speech. The use of quotative discourse markers in Spanish, including *como*, could also be viewed as the
result of contact with English. Similar to the use of *be like* in Spanish, quotative discourse markers are also very frequent, amounting to 38 tokens. Quotative discourse markers are conditioned differently than *be like* in English by favoring the introducing of internal monologue. Lastly, quotative discourse markers have been documented in a non-contact variety in Madrid (Palacios Martínez, 2013, 2014). Once again, a candidate for a truly contact-induced linguistic change must be absent or conditioned differently in non-contact varieties (Poplack & Levey, 2010, p. 398).

The differences in the linguistic conditioning of the English and Spanish quotative systems in the speech of the same bilinguals highlight the presence of two distinct systems of quotatives in each language. While *be like* has replaced the use of *say* in English and favors introducing reported speech, *decir* in Spanish is still the most frequently used quotative in Spanish accounting for half of the quotatives in the corpus and favors introducing reported speech. Null quotatives and bare-noun phrases in Spanish appear to also be used to introduce reported speech in addition to *decir*, but quotative discourse markers and *be like* appear to favor internal monologue. Perhaps both the direct borrowing of *be like* and quotative discourse markers are entering in the Spanish quotative system by introducing internal monologue and are therefore not directly competing with the use of *decir*.

Regarding the linguistic and social conditioning of general extenders, there was not a significant difference in the overall frequencies of general extenders in English and Spanish, and these frequencies were not correlated with sex and dominance. The most frequent forms of general extenders in English were *and stuff, or something (like that)* and *and everything (like that)*. The most frequent forms of general extenders in Spanish
were y todo (eso), o algo (así), and y así. Adjunctive general extenders beginning with and/y were more frequent than disjunctive general extenders beginning with or/o in both languages. General extenders in Spanish are significantly longer than general extenders in English. Moreover, general extenders were used to fulfill referential functions significantly more often in Spanish than in English regardless of sex and dominance. Referential general extenders were significantly longer than non-referential general extenders in both languages.

Contact with English does not appear to influence the use of general extenders in Spanish. There was no evidence of the borrowing of form. No English forms of general extenders were used in Spanish or vice versa. There was also no evidence of the borrowing of function. General extenders in Spanish were used to fulfill referential functions significantly more often than general extenders in English.

The differences in the linguistic conditioning of general extenders in English and Spanish could indicate different stages their development in each language. Since general extenders in English are both shorter and used to fulfill non-referential functions at a higher rate, general extenders may be at a more advanced stage of development in English than in Spanish. Moreover, the relationship between form and function holds because referential general extenders are significantly longer than non-referential extenders in both languages.

The results of this dissertation conflict with previous studies of the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals. There is no evidence of the displacement of discourse-pragmatic features in Spanish (Salmons, 1990; Torres 2002; Torres & Potowski. 2008). Furthermore, there is no evidence of convergence to lessen the
cognitive load (Fuller, 2001; Matras, 1998, 2000), fill a gap (Hill & Hill, 1986; Hlavic, 2006) or mark or strengthen discourse boundaries (Dajko & Carmichael, 2014; de Rooij, 2000; Maschler, 1994, 1997, 2009). Perhaps this is most evident by looking at the number of English discourse tokens in Spanish outside of code-switching of more than one word. In the Spanish corpus of 66,764 words there were 93 tokens of like in English (0.14%; 93/66,764), 27 tokens of be like (0.04%; 27/66,764), and 0 tokens of English general extenders (0%; 93/66,764). The novelty of this study is that it analyzes not only the frequency but also the linguistic and social conditioning of the use of discourse-pragmatic features in the speech in both languages of the same bilinguals. It is only by analyzing the linguistic and social conditioning of these discourse-pragmatic features in both languages of the same bilinguals that the permeability of discourse in the speech of bilinguals can be assessed.

The subtleties of discourse-pragmatic features discussed in this dissertation such as the syntactic position of like and como, the content of the quote of quotatives, and the discourse functions of general extenders, are not salient outside of linguistic circles and are not explicitly taught. The results of this dissertation in which there are significant differences in the linguistic and social conditioning of each of these discourse-pragmatic features in both languages in the speech of the same Spanish-English bilinguals underline their bilingual competence and their knowledge of the subtitles of the discourse-pragmatic features in both languages. Now that the results of this dissertation have been summarized, the following section turns to some of their pedagogical implications.
5.3. Pedagogical Applications

A follow-up question to the results of this dissertation is how this knowledge of discourse-pragmatic features in the speech of bilinguals can be applied in the language classroom. Very few studies have analyzed the use of discourse-pragmatic features by second or heritage language learners (Belz & Vyatkina, 2005; Carter & Jones, 2014; Fung & Carter, 2007; Kim, 2012; Muller, 2005; Polat, 2011; Romero Trillo, 2002). Some studies have found that second language learners use discourse-pragmatic features less frequently than native speakers (Fung & Carter, 2007; Romero Trillo, 2002) although this has been shown to depend on the discourse-pragmatic feature (Muller, 2005; Polat, 2011) and the stage of acquisition (Polat, 2011). These same studies have also concluded that second language learners use discourse-pragmatic features to fulfill fewer pragmatic functions than native speakers (Fung & Carter, 2007; Romero Trillo, 2002), although this has also been shown to depend on the discourse-pragmatic feature (Muller, 2005). Another study concluded that heritage language learners use discourse-pragmatic features less frequently than monolingual speakers (Kim, 2012). Lastly, a few studies drawing on classroom research have shown that explicit teaching of discourse-pragmatic features in the classroom can increase their usage (Belz & Vyatkina, 2005; Carter & Jones, 2014).

Before continuing, one may question why discourse-pragmatic features should be incorporated in the classroom. This sentiment hearkens back to Picher’s (2010) observation that discourse-pragmatic features have often been dismissed from linguistic investigation by being seen as meaningless signs of lacking fluency or inarticulateness but they should be considered a part of linguistic competence (p. 582). The results of this dissertation demonstrate that discourse-pragmatic features should be considered a part of
what Canale and Swain (1980) denote as grammatical competence, a component of communicative competence, which was first identified by Hymes (1972). More recently, Kramsch (2006) has introduced symbolic competence, which embeds Hymes’s (1972) concept of communicative competence in the symbolic systems in which we communicate, including modes of communication, genre, style, register and linguistic ideologies (Kramsch, 2006). Kramsch and Whiteside (2008) define symbolic competence as “the ability not only to approximate or appropriate for oneself someone else’s language, but to shape the very context in which the language is learned and used” (p. 664). As the linguistic elements that are used to guide, structure, or express a stance towards discourse (Pichler, 2013, p. 4), the use of discourse-pragmatic features is imperative to shaping the context in which language is learned and used.

Kramsch (2006) identifies three components of symbolic competence. The “production of complexity” recognizes that learning a language is more complex “than just saying the right word to the right person in the right manner” (p. 251). The “tolerance of ambiguity” involves “contradictions” in language that do not always have to be resolved (p. 251). Lastly, the component of “form as meaning” emphasizes “the meaning of form in all its manifestations (e.g., linguistic, textual, visual, acoustic, poetic)” (p. 251). Both the formal and functional properties of discourse-pragmatic features as well as their situated use in discourse reflect all three of these components. Incorporating discourse-pragmatic features in the classroom can be a way to bridge form and function in language learning and embed communication in the symbolic systems in which we communicate.
Embedding communication in the symbolic systems in which we communicate means viewing any example of communication as a symbolic system. Kramsch (2011) identifies three aspects of viewing discourse as a symbolic system. The “symbolic representation” of discourse recognizes that linguistic structure can be symbolic of meaning. The “symbolic action” of discourse recognizes that linguistic structure can be symbolic of performance. Lastly, the “symbolic power” of discourse recognizes that linguistic structure can be symbolic of the ideologies and identities that it indexes (p. 357). This third aspect of “symbolic power” is particularly crucial for distinguishing symbolic competence from communicative competence. Whereas communicative competence centers on acquiring skills (e.g. speaking, reading, writing) in a second language, symbolic competence focuses on interpreting and creating meaning in a second language within the power game of communication. Teaching discourse-pragmatic features, especially their functional properties and their situated use, provides an opportunity to role play the power game of communication in the classroom.

Kramsch (2011) offers specific critical questions to foster the acquisition of symbolic competence through discourse.

1. Not which words, but whose words are those? Whose discourse? Whose interests are being served by this text?

2. What made these words possible, and others impossible?

3. How does the speaker position him/herself?

4. How does he/she frame the events talked about?

5. What prior discourses does he/she draw on? (Kramsch, 2011, p. 360)
Once again, since discourse-pragmatic features are used to guide, structure, or express a stance towards discourse (Pichler, 2013, p. 4), they can be used to position social actors and the framing of events within discourse and can also be used to index prior discourses.

While much of Kramsch’s work is theoretical, the idea of symbolic competence can be concretized in the classroom through a multiliteracies approach (New London Group, 1996, 2000), which calls for incorporating a “multiplicity of discourses” to teach literacy (New London Group, 1996, p. 61). According to a multiliteracies approach, literacy is viewed as “the use of socially-, historically-, and culturally-situated practices of creating and interpreting meaning through texts” (Kern, 2000, p. 16). Consequently, language appropriation is subordinated to language use and critical thinking is favored over the linear transfer of meanings. Scholars have demonstrated how a Multiliteracies approach can be incorporated in both the second language classroom (e.g., Allen & Paesani, 2010; Paesani, Allen & Dupuy, 2016) and the heritage language classroom (Samaniego & Warner, 2016).

The pedagogical frameworks of Learning by Design and Available Designs have been applied to incorporate a Multiliteracies approach in the heritage language classroom (Samaniego & Warner, 2016). The Learning by Design pedagogical framework consists of four components: Experiencing, Conceptualizing, Analyzing, and Applying. By Experiencing, students reflect on their experiences and immerse themselves in what is new. By Conceptualizing, students classify and define terminology. By Analyzing, students connect ideas and evaluate them. Lastly, by applying, students apply their learning to real-life situations (Kalantzis & Cope, 2010). The Available Designs
pedagogical framework was originally proposed for literacy education. In this framework, literacy is layered. The text is embedded in available designs including grammar, vocabulary, writing systems, procedural knowledge, genres, style, stories, and declarative knowledge (schemata). The text and available designs are embedded in immediate and eventual communicative contexts including the audience, purpose, social roles, physical situation, topic, and task. Lastly, the text, available designs, and immediate and eventual communicative contexts are embedded in the sociocultural context, which includes sociocultural practices in the home community, the foreign language classroom, and the target society (Kern, 2000, pp. 63-64).

Drawing on the pedagogical frameworks of Learning by Design and Available Designs, the following pedagogical framework (Figure 5.1) for incorporating sociolinguistic diversity in the language classroom can be used to incorporate discourse-pragmatic features in the classroom and facilitate the acquisition of symbolic competence.

**Figure 5.1: Framework for Incorporating Sociolinguistic Diversity in the Language Classroom**
The framework begins with an element or combination of elements of sociolinguistic diversity that the teacher wishes to incorporate in the classroom. In this case, the element of sociolinguistic diversity will be discourse-pragmatic features, but this framework could also be used to incorporate other elements of sociolinguistic diversity including phonological or morphosyntactic variables. The element(s) of sociolinguistic diversity chosen by the teacher is then contextualized in a text, which can include literature, sociolinguistic corpora, music, film or any other representation of language use that contextualizes several examples of the element(s) of sociolinguistic diversity that the teacher wishes to incorporate in the classroom. In this case, the text will be the current corpora of conversations in Spanish and English between pairs of bilingual friends. Students then experience, interpret, analyze, and play with the examples of the element(s) of sociolinguistic diversity that are embedded in the text.

Each layer of the model corresponds to a deeper understanding of the element(s) of sociolinguistic diversity that the teacher chooses to incorporate. By Experiencing, students read, listen, or interact with the text. By Interpreting, which corresponds to “Conceptualizing” in Kalantzis and Cope’s (2010) model, students consider what the examples of sociolinguistic diversity mean to them inside and outside of the context of the text. By Analyzing, students explore how these examples contribute to the message of the text. The critical questions from Kramsch (2011) previously presented can aid this process. Analyzing sociolinguistic diversity in the text requires taking into account the relationship between the examples of the element(s) of sociolinguistic diversity in the text and the positioning of social actors and the framing of events within the text, as well as the prior discourses that are indexed. Lastly, by Play, which corresponds to “Applying” in
Kalantzis and Cope’s (2010) model, students create their own texts with elements of sociolinguistic diversity.

The framework applies Kalantzis and Cope’s (2010) Learning by Design framework to a new context. It also integrates Kern’s (2000) framework of Available Designs. Experiencing the text allows students to draw on their available designs including grammar, vocabulary, writing systems, procedural knowledge, genres, style, stories, and declarative knowledge (schemata). Interpreting the meaning of examples of sociolinguistic diversity inside and outside of the context of the text takes into account immediate and eventual communicative contexts. Analyzing how examples of sociolinguistic diversity contribute to the message of the text involves the “sociocultural context” of language use in the home community, the foreign language classroom, and the target society. As students move on to another component of the framework, another layer of Kern’s (2000) model is explored. Lastly through Play, students begin with the “sociocultural context” of their own language use and collapse the layers of Kern’s (2000) model one by one to create their own texts in their own varieties, embedding their language use within their own sociocultural context that surrounds it.

Discourse-pragmatic features can be incorporated in the Spanish classroom by using this framework and the present corpus as a text. For the first component of Experiencing, students can listen to narratives from the current corpus and read the accompanying transcriptions, such as the following narratives in English and Spanish from Chapter 1 of this dissertation, in which all of the discourse-pragmatic features used are bolded.
5B2: He was dancing with a girl and they were both drunk and the girl was my friend that made the party. And I got mad ‘cause he was like taking advantage of her, he was touching her and everything. And I got more mad that he did the, he like spilled the drink. And then he was doing that.

5B1: Yeah.

5B2: So I remember I got mad and like I, I- I’m not a fighter, and I pushed him. Like instantly I just pushed him,

5B1: ((gasp))

5B2: Yeah, I got mad, I don’t know what happened but I got mad and I pushed him and then it took him a few like seconds to like realize that I pushed him,

5B1: Yeah.

5B2: And then he comes up to me, like, “Did you just push me?” And like I, and I was mad, I was like, “Yeah, I pushed you, you’re dancing like a dumbass. Like move over, like get to the dance floor and not on the, on the edge.” And with that, like he got really mad and he got my friend to the side, and he was like right in my face. And I got mad.

5B1: He tried to fight you?

5B2: Yeah, he wanted to fight me. And I got mad, too so I got in his face, too.

5B1: ((gasp))
5B2: And then out of nowhere like I, I feel like people pulling me. And then I got kicked out of the house. Instead of him (5BE).

(2) 5B2: Creo que yo fui el estudiante malo con una maestra.

5B1: ¿Sí?

5B2: Sí, en la prepa, haz de cuenta que en la prepa era una maestra nueva y venía de XXX y era de inglés y la tenía para mis últimas clases y era bien frustrante la mujer porque nos trataba como niños chiquitos, así como: “Ay mi niño, no se les olvide las gomitas” así como, ay, no sé, bien frustrante.

5B1: Sí.

5B2: Y luego de que-

5B1: Asco.

5B2: Ajá, te lo juro así y luego, no sé, si hacías algo o te portabas mal en la clase, te comportabas mal en clase, o lo que sea, al ratito te dejaba como una notita: “Sé que estás en un mal día. Vamos a hablar sobre tus problemas y yo voy a estar aquí para apoyarte.” Así como dices: “Okay pues ya” (5BS).

5B2: I think that I was the bad student with a teacher.

5B1: Really?

5B2: Yes, in high school, realize that in high school there was a new teacher and she came from XXX and she was an English teacher and I had her for my last classes and she was really frustrating because
she treated us like little kids, like “Ay my child, don’t forget the erasers” like, ay, I don’t know, really frustrating.

5B1: Yes

5B2: And then

5B1: Gross

5B2: Uh-huh. I swear, like that and then, I don’t know, if you did something or misbehaved in the class, you were being bad in the class, or whatever, later she would leave you like a little note: “I know you are having a bad day. We are going to talk about your problems and I am going to be here to support you.” Until you say: “Okay, enough already” (5BS).

For the second component of Interpreting, students can explore what these examples of discourse-pragmatic features mean to them inside and outside of the context of the narrative. Some critical questions that could be asked include: Have you heard or learned about discourse-pragmatic features before?; What are your opinions about the use of discourse-pragmatic features in English and Spanish?; Do you use discourse-pragmatic features in English?; Do you use discourse-pragmatic features in Spanish? For this component, the saliency of discourse-pragmatic features is explored as well as students’ linguistic attitudes towards their use.

For the third component of Analyzing, students explore how discourse-pragmatic features contribute to the message of the text. Some critical questions that could be asked include: If any of these examples were removed or replaced with something different how would the narrative change?; How does the speaker position him/herself through the
use discourse-pragmatic features?; How does he/she frame the events talked about through the use of discourse-pragmatic features?; How does he/she index prior discourses through the use of discourse-pragmatic features. For this component, the use of discourse-pragmatic features in the text is explored in detail so students learn how they are used.

Lastly, for the fourth component of Play, students can complete a project in which they analyze discourse-pragmatic features in another narrative on their own, collect their own data and analyze the use of discourse-pragmatic features, and/or make a video in which they tell their own narrative while using discourse-pragmatic features. These activities can be adapted according to the level of the course and also for both second and heritage language learners. The purpose of this component is to apply their knowledge of discourse-pragmatic features and use them themselves.

The four components of this framework scaffold the use of discourse-pragmatic features, guiding students to explore their use and eventually use them themselves. It is hoped that the proposed framework for incorporating discourse-pragmatic features in the classroom demonstrates how sociolinguistics research can contribute to pedagogy. The analysis of how discourse-pragmatic features can contribute to the positioning of social actors, the framing of events inside and outside of the discourse context, and the indexing of prior discourses can facilitate symbolic competence by teaching students how to shape the context in which language is learned and used. The proposed pedagogical framework also embraces a more nuanced view of literacy, which should include the ability to use discourse-pragmatic features. Lastly, it legitimizes the use of discourse-pragmatic features in both the target language and the students’ native languages as a part of
grammatical competence. Now that some pedagogical applications have been discussed the following section turns to the contributions of this dissertation and future directions for research.

5.4. Contributions and Future Directions

This dissertation consisting of three related studies of the use of discourse-pragmatic features in the English and Spanish of the same bilinguals have four clear contributions that will be discussed here. First, the results of all three studies contribute to our knowledge of languages in contact. Several studies have argued that discourse-pragmatic features are permeable and subject to borrowing in contact situations (e.g., Brody, 1987, 1995; Dajko & Carmichael, 2014), but the results of these three studies do not provide support for this conclusion. There is very little of evidence of contact with English in the use of discourse-pragmatic features in Spanish in the speech of these bilinguals, both through form, but also even more deeply through function. Studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact situations should proceed with caution regarding the interpretation of results, and should certainly avoid assumptions that evidence of contact with English will definitely be present at the discourse level.

A second contribution of this dissertation is its methodology, which differs from several previous studies of discourse-pragmatic features in contact and studies in variationist sociolinguistics in general. First, participants were recorded having informal conversations without the presence of the interviewer, which avoids the observer’s paradox. The quality of the data analyzed in this dissertation, which includes false starts, overlapping turns, taboo words and a high frequency of discourse-pragmatic features,
would almost certainly not be the same if a researcher were present. Secondly, this dissertation is the first study of discourse-pragmatic features in contact to analyze the linguistic and social conditioning of discourse-pragmatic features in both the donor and the recipient language in the speech of the same bilinguals. It is only by analyzing the permeability of discourse-pragmatic features in both English and Spanish that the role of contact with English in the use of discourse-pragmatic features in Spanish can be assessed.

Third, the results of this dissertation contribute to a growing body of research on U.S. Spanish and even the use of discourse-pragmatic features in U.S. English, which has been understudied. Most importantly, the results of this dissertation provide additional evidence that U.S. Spanish is not a pidgin, a new language that mixes features from both English in Spanish. Rather, these results provide evidence for a vibrant use of discourse-pragmatic features in U.S. Spanish, with minimal differences from other varieties including monolingual ones.

Lastly, this dissertation goes further to discuss the pedagogical applications of these results by proposing a pedagogical framework that can be applied across second and heritage language pedagogical contexts to foster the acquisition of discourse-pragmatic features in the classroom. It is hoped that this discussion serves as an example of how these results can be applied in a real-life context to give back to a community that has been incredibly generous to this research. This pedagogical application of the research is especially made possible through the generosity of the participants of this dissertation who offered their time to participate in this two-hour study on two separate occasions. This application will be explored further and strengthened with classroom
research on the incorporation of discourse-pragmatic features in the classroom by utilizing the proposed pedagogical framework.

Future studies will explore the use of more discourse-pragmatic features in the current data including additional discourse markers (o sea, entonces, and so), taboo words (fuck), and gesture. The video recordings of this research are especially conducive for conversation analysis, providing the opportunity for future research on conversations between Spanish-English bilingual friends in both languages. Similarly, the use of direct speech in both English and Spanish will also be explored further, especially the linguistic features that appear within the content of direct quotation. In addition, more data will be collected from bilinguals following the same methodology of this dissertation and it is hoped that other scholars who are investigating discourse-pragmatic features in contact will consider adopting this methodology for future comparative research. For now, the results of this dissertation contribute to our knowledge of discourse-pragmatic features in contact, the research methods for analyzing discourse-pragmatic variation, a growing body of research on U.S. Spanish, and the incorporation of discourse-pragmatic features in the classroom.
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