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Abstract

This dissertation explores a phenomenon of negative doubling in Chipilo, Mexico, an area of contact between Spanish and Veneto (an Italo-Romance language). The current project presents a rare window for the study of simultaneous bilingualism and contact-induced language change through the combination of different methods: elicited conversational speech and experimental work. It has been hypothesized that Italo-Mexican bilinguals who speak Veneto (L1) and Spanish (L2) have transferred a second no in final position (no fui no ‘I did not go NEG’) from their L1 into Spanish, a language that does not allow repetition of the same negator in postverbal position. This study analysed the data of 117 participants (Chipileños, participants of mixed descent, and monolingual speakers) classified into two sex, two age and four ethnicity groups. The project investigated whether transfer was present and how social and linguistic factors influenced the phenomenon. Participants performed one semi-spontaneous task and three controlled tasks (Forced Choice Preference Task, Sentence Completion Task, and Sentence Repetition Task). The results reveal transfer from L1 to L2 in the bilinguals’ speech, specifically in the discourse of males and younger speakers across all four tasks, with the higher rate in two controlled tasks. With regard to linguistic factors, second negative mention and specific negators in a preverbal position had a significantly favouring effect on the production of negative doubling (ND), which suggests
transfer effects from minority language to the majority language. Overall, this project is pioneering as it provides important insight into studying morphosyntactic variation, specifically negation in a bilingual context, by using a combination of sociolinguistic methodology and experimental work. This project makes crucial contributions to the field of language variation and change, by stressing the importance of studying variation through the interplay of structural and non-structural factors that promote or impede contact-induced changes in a given community.
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Chapter 1
Introduction to morphosyntactic variation in a language contact situation

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an introduction to the study of a morphosyntactic phenomenon in a bilingual setting. More specifically, the current dissertation explores negative doubling in Chipilo, an Italo-Mexican community that has preserved its minority language, Veneto, for over 100 years. Over time, a substantial amount of lexical, prosodic, and morphological features from Veneto have been transferred to the Spanish language of these bilingual speakers (Barnes, 2009). This project presents a rare window for the study of simultaneous bilingualism and contact induced language change through the combination of different methods, including conversational elicitation speech and experimental work. The goals of this dissertation are to investigate transfer effects of negation in declarative sentences in the Spanish speech of Italo-Mexican bilinguals and deepen our understanding of factors that promote transfer of a morphosyntactic phenomenon. This investigation examines the domain of morphosyntax and uses prosody to determine whether relevant utterances are cases of negative doubling (no... no), as in (1) in Spanish:

(1) Spanish:  \[ El \ no \ va \ no \]
\[ He \ NEG \ goes \ NEG \]
‘He does not go, (NEG)’
Negative doubling (ND), a morphosyntactic phenomenon, is the occurrence of two negators in the same utterance. In standard Spanish, sentential negation is marked preverbally by the particle *no*, as in (2):

(2) Spanish:  

\[ Yo \text{ no } hablo \text{ italiano} \]

I NEG speak Italian

‘I do not speak Italian’

The presence of final negators and negative doubling in declarative sentences is considered ungrammatical in Spanish, unless the final negator is part of a tag question with a rising contour and a possible pause at the end of the utterance, as in (3):

(3) Spanish:  

\[ Jorge \text{ no } come \text{ las enchiladas, } \¿ \text{no}? \]

Jorge NEG eats enchiladas, NEG?

‘Jorge does not eat enchiladas, right?’

In this case, the final *no* forms its own Negation Phrase, which is not part of the same clause. Cases like (3) are grammatical in Spanish and will be treated as part of standard negation (SN) in this dissertation.

Negation in Veneto, similar to negation in Spanish, is also preverbal as in (4):

(4) Veneto:  

\[ Mi \text{ no } so \]

I NEG know-1SG

‘I do not know’

However, there is a possibility of using two negators, one preverbally and one sentence finally, as in (5):

(5) Veneto:  

\[ Mi \text{ no } so \text{ no} \]

I NEG know-1SG NEG

‘I do not know’
To my knowledge, there has not been an extensive study on the rate of use of the final *no* in Veneto, but Cecilia Poletto, a scholar from Northern Italy, notes that the use of final *no* is very common, especially in informal settings (personal communication, January 30, 2016).

As indicated above, sentential negation in Spanish can only be preverbal; the incorporation of another final *no* into the same IP is considered ungrammatical. Bilingual speakers in Chipilo have two possible ways of negating a sentence when speaking Spanish. On the one hand, they can use a preverbal negative marker similar to monolingual Spanish speakers as in (2). On the other hand, bilingual speakers in Chipilo may add one more negator with a falling contour before the negative particle, as seen in (6):

(6) Chipileño Spanish:  \( \text{Yo no fui no} \)

I NEG went NEG

‘I did not go’

The second negator is incorporated prosodically in the utterance, which provides evidence that this is a statement, rather than a tag question. Therefore, it is interesting to investigate whether all bilingual speakers transfer the second *no* with its prosody from Veneto when speaking Spanish. In this project, standard negation will refer to two possible cases: a) a preverbal *no* particle or a preverbal negative word (e.g. *nadie* ‘nobody’) only, and b) a preverbal *no* or negative word in combination with a tag *no* question, since both of these are considered grammatical in standard Spanish. In contrast, ND is defined as the co-existence of a preverbal *no* and a sentence final negator *no* with a falling intonation. It is important to keep in mind that this final *no* is not interpreted as a negator. In other words, the preverbal *no* is the only true negation, and there is no double negation interpretation. Therefore, the truth conditions of a sentence with SN and ND are identical. I return to discussing syntax of negation in more detail in Chapter 2.

Patterns of variation and change of the negative doubling phenomenon in Chipilo present a unique opportunity to gain insight into the grammar of bilingual speakers. There are a number of previous studies that have examined the historical evolution of negative doubling and its syntactic and semantic functions in discourse (e.g., Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2008; Poletto, 2008; RAE, 2010; Sánchez López, 1999; Teixeira de Souza, 2011, 2012, 2015). To my
knowledge, there have been very few studies that analyzed negative doubling from a sociolinguistic perspective, the standpoint of this dissertation, and these studies have used spontaneous speech only (see Cuervo and Mazzaro (2013) for discussion on Corrientes Spanish in Argentina; Sankoff and Vincent (1980) for discussion on the distribution of *ne* in spoken French).

It is important to keep in mind a number of problems associated with investigating any morphosyntactic variation. For example, one main challenge is obtaining a sufficient number of tokens to analyze data and find possible significant factors. Specifically, researchers argue that morphosyntactic variation can be problematic to analyze in terms of finding the best method and identifying the envelope of variation or contexts of use (Lavandera, 1974; Milroy, 1987; Milroy & Gordon, 2003; Torres Cacoullos, 2011). Furthermore, Milroy and Gordon (2003) report that such methodological difficulty arises specifically in eliciting morphosyntactic variation through spontaneous speech (pp. 144-145). The interview method, commonly used to elicit phonological variation, might not be the best one for studying morphosyntactic variation simply because a variable might not be used in a spontaneous ‘free-topic’ interview. A slightly different approach to data gathering was successfully applied by Lavandera (1974). In her study of *cocoliche* speech in Argentina, a variety spoken by Italian immigrants, Lavandera (1974) studied *if-clauses* in subjunctive mood and conditional clauses using the guided interview method. With a set of guiding questions, Lavandera was able to gather sufficient data (cited in Milroy & Gordon, 2003).

Given the aforementioned methodological issue, experimental work with more controlled tasks (e.g., forced choice preference tasks, acceptability judgment tasks, picture naming tasks, reading tasks), as well as semi-spontaneous tasks with guided questions should be performed in order to examine possible contexts of variation and use. This dissertation offers a different approach to the earlier studies by focusing on both semi-spontaneous data and controlled tasks to investigate in depth which social and linguistic factors influence the distribution of negative doubling.

The second major problem in analyzing morphosyntactic variation lies in identifying semantic equivalence between two variants. This lays the foundation for describing and analyzing variation, i.e., the possible context(s) of each variant, the constraints on use, and finally the function of a variant in a specific context. The term ‘variation’ refers to a setting where two
variants occupy the same semantic space, i.e., two variants are interchangeable if they carry the same functional and semantic meaning (Milroy & Gordon, 2003). Unlike phonological variation, which carries no meaning, morphosyntactic variation does. Yet, as some scholars argue (e.g., Embick, 2008; Lavandera, 1974; Milroy & Gordon, 2003; Torres Cacoullos, 2011), it is often not easy to define the function and the context of each of the variants. These scholars claim that speakers eventually overuse one of the two grammatically-equivalent variants in a specific context while the other one is ultimately lost. One of the examples is the use of Spanish morphological future simple tense /-ɾe/, previously used in all contexts in the future (Torres Cacoullos, 2011). In a diachronic study using variationist methods, Torres Cacoullos (2011) tracked the patterns of use and context of variation of /-ɾe/ and a different marker, *ir a* ‘to be going to’, which over the years became functionally similar. In her study, she identified the envelope of variation for both variants and concluded that each of the variants, being grammatically equivalent to the other, started to be used only in specific contexts. The conclusion that Torres Cacoullos (2011) draws is somewhat compatible with Kroch’s Grammar Competition Model, which predicts that over time, the form with the highest frequency of use will eventually block the other form, and will be the only possible output (Kroch, 1989). In the case of Torres Cacoullos (2011), however, the variants are not lost but rather appear in different contexts and function differently.

It is possible, however, to have alternations in the production of a linguistic variable. A model that specifically analyzes the form of a variable was proposed by Adger and Smith (2005). They analyzed the alternation of use of past tense ‘was/were’ in Buckie English in Scotland. Based on their proposal, the use of one or the other verb variant (‘was’ or ‘were’) lies in combining one semantically interpretable syntactic feature with two or more uninterpretable bundling features. Based on the model, it is possible to have more than one spell-out morpheme or phonological output, which can check a relevant interpretable feature: “they was/they were”. The difference between the two, however, lies in bundling one semantic interpretable feature with a different uninterpretable [*u*] feature (e.g., case or agreement). For example, in the sentence, ‘You were/was in Buckie’, the tense of the verb [tense: past] is an interpretable feature, whereas case [*u*case:nom] and agreement between the verb and the pronoun [*unum:pl*] are two uninterpretable features. Pronouns bear interpretable person and number features, which through the checking operations of Agree (the verb and the pronoun) produce one semantic output and two phonological outputs. Therefore, in Buckie English, the agreement [*u*] between the subject and
the verb allows to spell out two phonological outputs: “You [unum:pl] were in Buckie”, as well as “You [unum:sg] was in Buckie”. Eventually, through the interplay between forms and features over an extensive period of time, one of the variants will be used with a higher probability. In other words, the variation arises from lexical items having, by the end of the syntactic derivation, the same interpretable feature specification coupled with different uninterpretable and phonological specifications (Adger & Smith, 2005, p. 155). Therefore, the difference between the Grammar Competition Model and this model has to do with the optionality of using two variants and the probability of use. The Grammar Competition Model does not allow this optionality synchronically as the end result, but rather focuses on the importance of blocking effects on one of the variants, which eventually ‘wins’ out and becomes the only one used.

Therefore, it is crucial to identify the envelope of variation between two variants, their function and use in a specific context. In the case of Chipilo, it is important to investigate and analyze linguistic variables to see whether standard negation and negative doubling occur in separate environments. If it does, then the two variants are in complementary distribution and Kroch’s Grammar Competing Model can be applicable. If, however, the results show that both variants occur in the same environment, then we can conclude that they are in free variation, and therefore the Variation Model is more relevant. My present dissertation does not explicitly test these two models, but after analysing the results in Chapter 4, I propose possible explanations, opting for the Variation Model.

1.2 Areas of contributions of the dissertation

The current dissertation sheds new light on the study of morphosyntactic variation through the use of an innovative methodology. Specifically, it provides important insight into negation in a bilingual context. The findings from this dissertation will furthermore make an important contribution to the field of language variation and change as a whole.
1.2.1 Methodological contributions

This dissertation combines various methodologies to explore the effects of both social and linguistic factors on negative doubling in Chipilo for the first time. The project uses mixed methods research, the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods, including both elicited conversational speech and experimental work (Ivankova & Greer, 2015). To my knowledge there has not been any sociolinguistic study on Chipileño Spanish – or negation in general – that has used elicited conversational speech and controlled tasks (e.g., sentence completion, sentence repetition, and forced choice preference tasks). Combining and using both methods concurrently is both essential and beneficial for understanding the nature of ND and assessing the distribution and significance of the phenomenon.

1.2.2 Contributions to the study of morphosyntactic variation

As previously mentioned, most studies on negation have focused on diachronic aspects of negation or its syntactic analysis. Up to now, far too little attention has been given to studying negation from a sociolinguistic point of view. This project provides a detailed investigation of the phenomenon, using data from spontaneous speech and from controlled tasks, so as to analyze which factors contribute to the occurrence of the phenomenon. Moreover, this dissertation offers a deeper understanding of variation in negation in Chipilo, as well as in other Romance dialects, by comparing differences and similarities in negative doubling across varieties.

1.2.3 General contributions to the field of language variation and change
This project departs distinctly from much previous research. Instead of focusing on minority language patterns of shift or loss, it examines variation in the majority language among bilingual speakers. This is something rare, since minority languages usually undergo language attrition and then loss after three generations (e.g., Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Trudgill, 1982). This dissertation therefore offers important implications for developing future proposals or theories that deal with contact-induced changes and transgenerational relationships in a bilingual setting. Unlike earlier research (e.g., Labov, 1972; Milroy, 1987), which predominantly focused on monolingualism and the dominant culture in English, this project examines the transfer from a minority language into the dominant one. Furthermore, it focuses on Romance varieties, broadening the scope of sociolinguistic research. Most importantly, the project investigates which factor(s), social or linguistic, determine the retention and transfer of a language feature in a bilingual setting.

This project analyses the morphosyntactic phenomenon from a sociolinguistic perspective; it is therefore crucial to understand the principles of variation and change by identifying the effects of both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. The next section discusses major differences in speakers’ speech patterns, according to sex, age, and ethnicity variables – the three extralinguistic variables analysed in this dissertation.

1.3 Principles of Variation

1.3.1 Extralinguistic variable: gender

The literature generally supports the claim that women are vanguards of linguistic change, specifically in monolingual settings (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003; Labov, 2001). The studies of Labov (1991, 2001) in Philadelphia and New York present several important insights supported in the literature and are thus essential to this project. Labov introduces two principles of sexual differentiation. Principle I states:
In stable sociolinguistic stratification, men use a higher frequency of nonstandard forms than women.

(7) In stable sociolinguistic stratification, men use a higher frequency of nonstandard forms than women.

(Labov, 1991, p. 205)

In other words, according to his proposal, males show a preference to employ non-standard and vernacular forms in stable sociolinguistic variation. Moreover, Labov adds a notion to Principle I and states that in a stable social context, women are the ones who favour prestige forms more than males when they are fully aware or conscious of their production. Thus, females opt for more frequent use of standard, prestige forms, avoiding stigmatized and vernacular variants. In his later study, Labov (2001) stresses, “in adopting new prestige features more rapidly than men, and in reacting more rapidly against the use of stigmatized forms, women are the chief agents of differentiation, responding more rapidly to changes in the status of linguistic variables” (p. 27).

According to his proposal, females show a lower rate of use of variants that are stigmatized or non-standard in the community but produce a variant at a higher rate when it is considered prestigious. In contrast, males show a preference to employ non-standard and vernacular forms in stable sociolinguistic variation. These conclusions have been widely supported in phonological and morphosyntactic literature (e.g., see Cameron (2005) and Holmquist (2005) on discussion of final /s/ deletion and retention in Puerto Rican Spanish; Lapidus Shin (2013) and Otheguy & Zentella (2012) on discussion of subject pronoun use in the Latino population in NYC). For example, two studies on phonological variation in Puerto Rican Spanish (Cameron, 2005; Holmquist, 2005) found greater retention of plural final /s/ marker among female speakers, which indicates the standard use of the variant. Male speakers, on the other hand, retained the variant only 20 % of the time; most of them omitted it. The other two studies (Lapidus Shin, 2013; Otheguy & Zentella, 2012) on morphosyntactic variation also found women producing the overt subject pronoun in Spanish at a higher rate than men did. Since Spanish is a pro-drop language, the subject of the clause can be omitted. Lapidus Shin (2013) finds, however, that females, specifically immigrant females, showed an increasing rate of subject pronoun use compared to males. These findings are attributed to better knowledge of English, a language in which subject pronouns are obligatory. Due to higher exposure to the dominant language, immigrant females more frequently incorporate the subject marker into Spanish. Another explanation, which Lapidus Shin (2013) suggests to be the most important factor, is female speakers’ contact with US-born children. Since mothers are usually the ones
that spend most of the time at home with children, they have more exposure to their children, who usually interact in English. Since English is a dominant language with prestigious status in the Latino community, females prefer to speak it more and probably adapt features from English to Spanish.

Therefore, based on the aforementioned claims and the support from previous literature, female speakers are the leaders of change who favour standard prestigious forms in both monolingual and bilingual-immigrant settings. The present dissertation seeks to determine whether female speakers’ speech is different from that of male speakers in a bilingual community where two languages are considered prestigious.

1.3.2 Extralinguistic variable: age

Another variable that this project examines is the effect of age on the rate of negative doubling. “The study of age in relation to language, particularly the study of sociolinguistic variation, lies at the intersection of life stage and history” (Eckert, 2017, p. 151). That is, age stratification of a linguistic variable can be based on the historical changes in the speech community or changes in the speech of the individual during his or her lifespan. Most of the previous literature (Labov, 1972; Eckert, 2017) supports the claim that adolescents and young individuals generally show the vernacular forms in order to construct their social identity. The use of newer forms become the indicators of linguistic change in progress (see Eckert, 2017; Labov, 1972).

On the other hand, speech in the adulthood stage is usually known as more conservative; adult speakers most often produce standard variants for various reasons, including the workplace environment and their position (Eckert, 2017; Labov, 1972; Milroy, 1980). Moreover, Labov (1972) suggests that in older groups, specifically female speakers “seem to relax” and find “greater freedom with the release […] from family […] or from their childbearing responsibilities” leading to “relaxation of their language use” (Eckert, 2017, p. 165). In other words, they seem to be less concerned with the marketplace and disengage from use of standard forms. This ‘relaxation’ leads in some cases to age grading, which is change in the speech of the individual during his or her lifespan (in Eckert, 2017, p. 151).
The present dissertation compares two age groups, 18-34 years old and 35-70 years old. According to previous studies, the second group is usually divided into two: middle aged and elder speakers. Due to a limited number of elder speakers (55+) with mixed parents (see next subsection), these two age groups were collapsed into one. The first group is referred to as ‘younger speakers’ and the second as ‘older speakers’.

1.3.3 Extralinguistic variable: parents’ ethnicity

In the past years, the monolingual Mexican population has started to grow and led to intermarriages between monolingual Mexican and bilingual Chipileños; thus, this dissertation explores a third social variable, parental ethnicity. In my Master’s thesis, I found strong correlation between Veneto language and Chipileño identity; many Chipileños identified themselves as being different from the monolingual group due to their knowledge of Veneto. Thus, it is interesting to explore the speech of the participants of mixed backgrounds, with one Chipileño parent and one majority Mexican (monolingual Spanish-speaking) parent each, to see whether their patterns of speech, specifically their production of negative doubling, is determined by the primary language spoken by their parents. In other words, it is interesting to investigate whether the language of one of the parents has an effect on the distribution of negative doubling in the speech of their children. Previous research (e.g., Lapidus Shin, 2013; Silva-Corvalán, 2001) shows that children usually resemble the speech of their mothers, since they are the ones who have extensive contact with them at home. A study, such as Potowski’s (2008) on Latino communities in the USA shows that children tend to resemble the speech of their mothers due to mother-child dialect transmission. While studying young participants with one Mexican and one Puerto Rican parent in the US, Potowski (2008) finds that in 75% of the cases, the lexicon and the phonetic patterns of the children resemble the speech patterns of their mother’s ethnic group. In other words, Potowski’s (2008) study corroborates the research on the mother’s primary role in child language development and the child’s resemblance to their mother in patterns of speech.
Though these previous studies focused on different communities, we can still take them as points of departure for the investigation of the effects of sex, age, and parents’ speech practices on the use of ND. Understanding the differences between social variables is important for the current dissertation, specifically for constructing hypotheses. To better understand the situation of the community, the next section provides an overview of Veneto immigration in the world, followed by the presentation of the community under study, including its history of immigration and current language situation. It pays particular attention to aspects relevant to the social factors just introduced.

1.4 Overview of Veneto immigration in the world

According to Tirabassi (2005), roughly 14 million Italian immigrants left their country before 1914. Immigration significantly increased during World War I, as well as during World War II during the fascist period. Starting from the 1950s, many Italians, especially from the south, moved to other European countries; the exception being Sicilians, who predominantly immigrated to the USA. Table 1.1 shows the distribution of Italian immigrants during the 19th century.

Table 1.1. Main destination countries of Italian emigration (1876-1976). Numbers refer to number of Italian immigrants (Schmid, 2005, p. 118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overseas</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,117,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3,989,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2,452,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>535,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>263,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,188,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12,546,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is not much data about other colonies founded by Veneto speakers in the world. Veneto speakers, however, primarily moved to Brazil and Mexico. Zago Bronca (2006) mentions a colony founded by Veneto speakers in 1875: La Perla de las Colonias, located in Caxais do Sul in the state of Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil. Upon arrival in Brazil, only 300 Veneto speakers were counted among the settlers in Caxais; three years later the population consisted of four thousand residents, and 25 years later, it reached over 25,000 people (Zago Bronca, 2006, pp. 46-47). That city became one of the most industrial and economically prosperous regions in the country. Today, Veneto is still spoken in the city, as well as in other nearby towns in Brazil, such as Santa Catarina and Parana. A similar community, Santa Teresa, exists in a neighbourhood in Rio de Janeiro, specifically in the mountains of Espírito Santo. According to personal communication with Sarah Loriato, the only linguistic researcher of the community, Italian immigrants also settled in the town roughly 140 years ago and have maintained the language up until the present day (personal communication, March 3rd, 2017). However, due to high exposure to Portuguese and Italian, which are taught at schools in the community, Veneto is used mostly among older speakers.

To sum up, very few settlements have preserved the Veneto language in either Mexico or Brazil. Two colonies in Brazil, Santa Teresa and Caxais, and Chipilo in Mexico have maintained the language and the identity for over a century, but due to their proximity to large cities, the maintenance of Veneto becomes more challenging. Unlike Brazil, Chipilo in Mexico has been able to preserve the Veneto language and heritage culture, and up until the present day represents a case of stable bilingualism. The next subsections present an overview of the community, focusing on the history of Veneto settlements, reasons for preserving the language, and the current language situation in Chipilo.

1.4.1 Overview of Chipilo

The case of Chipilo, Mexico — a bilingual, bi-cultural community of Veneto and Spanish — represents one of the few instances of multigenerational minority language maintenance. The

---

1 Refer to section 1.4.2 for the discussion of Veneto immigration to Mexico.
Veneto dialect continues to be used by the descendants of those who immigrated to Chipilo from Northern Italy over a century ago. Veneto also constitutes a minority language in Northern Italy. In this dissertation, these descendants and other bilingual Veneto-Spanish speakers are referred to as Chipileños. As Chipilo was a relatively isolated community until the last two decades, intermarriages between Chipileños and monolingual Mexicans were rare (Zago 1982, 2007). That is why this project examines very few older participants whose parents are from mixed ethnic groups.

1.4.2 History of the language contact situation in Chipilo

Between the years of 1878 and 1882, Mexico spent $160,000 for 22,458 hectares (about 56,000 acres) of land in the states of Morelos, Vera Cruz, San Luis Potosí, and Mexico City (Bohme, 1959, p.10). This was meant to invite and support Italian immigration in order to blanquear, or ‘whiten the indigenous race’, and increase the productivity of the Mexican land (Zago Bronca, 2007, p.70). The government of Porfirio Díaz, the president of Mexico, blamed the peasants, or indigenous people, for the failure of agricultural growth. According to them, bringing blonde or fair-skinned peasants from Europe, especially from Northern Italy, would solve the problem. Bringing gueros, ‘light skinned’ people, from Europe could supposedly change the situation for the better. By October 1881, the first agricultural colony, named Manuel González, was settled in Huatusco, Vera Cruz with 80 families, or 428 people. A second group of 597 Veneto speakers, arrived in Vera Cruz in January 1882 and settled a colony named Porfirio Díaz in Morelos, where 121 Mexicans already resided. The third group of 200 families arrived in the port of Veracruz in February of 1882, and shortly after formed three colonies: Carlos Pacheco in Puebla, Díez Gutiérrez in San Luis Potosí, and La Aldana in Mexico City. The last group of immigrants in the 19th century, approximately 68 families, arrived in the port of Veracruz in August 1882. Nineteen of these families were sent to Manuel González, one was sent to la Aldana and the remaining 38 families were sent to Fernando Leal, known today as Chipilo (Zago Bronca, 1982).
These immigrants arrived from three regions: Lombardy, Trentino, and Veneto. Yet, Zago Bronca (2007) mentions that Italians who settled in Chipilo primarily came from the Piedmont, Lombardy, and Veneto provinces. The majority of founder families in Chipilo came from the town of Treviso, Segusino province, as seen in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1. Map showing source of Chipilo immigration from Italy (Zago Bronca, 2007, p. 31)

The settlers from all the areas did not speak standard Italian, but rather the Veneto feltrino-bellunese or the Basso-Bellunese regional variety, spoken in the north of Italy. Veneto was considered a dialect after the unification of Italy in 1861 when the Republic of Venice became part of Italy. 80% of the population in the 1860s was illiterate. De Mauro’s (1963) statistics show that primary education in Italy in standard Italian was not widespread; secondary education was the privilege of only 8.9% Italians between 11 and 18 years old. By the end of the 19th century, only 2.5% of the entire active population spoke standard Italian fluently (De Mauro, 1963, pp. 40-41).
Therefore, similar ethnic and educational background united the community and led to a close-knit network. Veneto was used as an essential tool for communication and mutual comprehensibility.

1.4.3 Veneto language preservation in Chipilo

The case of Chipilo draws attention up until the present day because Veneto is still spoken in Mexico. Surprisingly, although it lacks a unified writing system, Veneto has been preserved for over 120 years. Historical isolation from the towns nearby and the homogeneity of the immigrants during the first years of settlement in the community (Meo Zilio, 1987b; Tararova, 2012; Zago Bronca, 1982) were two of the main factors in language maintenance and its preservation. Today, Chipilo is home to the sixth generation of Italian descendants. Veneto is still the first language of children in most bilingual families. However, the domains of use of Spanish and Veneto are different (Fishman, 1966). While Spanish is the official language of instruction and of government institutions, Veneto is the language of the family, used among friends, neighbours, and in the workplace. Barnes (2009) reports that 81.4% of participants use Veneto as the predominant language of the home during their childhood, and 73.2% claim that Veneto is the main language used in homes in adulthood (p. 116). While most Chipileños have reported that Veneto was their first language, exogamous marriages have resulted in some children learning Spanish first. This usually happens due to the occupation of the man who works outside the home, while the woman, by working at home, becomes the carrying agent of the language. Typically, if the woman is a monolingual Mexican speaker, usually the first language of the children is Spanish; however, if the woman is Chipileño the first language is Veneto. Moreover, Barnes (2009) suggests that when a child acquires Spanish at home, s/he learns Veneto later in life through interaction with Veneto-speaking children and community members. The data from Romani (1992) shows that 98% of her Chipileño participants of Italian descent learned Veneto at home, whereas only 10.5% claimed that they learned Spanish at home.
A study by Barnes (2009) echoes these findings by showing that today there is still a high percentage of speakers who acquire Veneto at home: 89% of the participants, in comparison to 24% of speakers who acquired Spanish at home (pp. 117-118). It is important to mention, though, that the use of either language depends on the interlocutor; if all participants are bilingual speakers, they use Veneto. However, if one of the interlocutors is a monolingual Spanish speaker, Spanish is used.

Zago Bronca (2006) states however, that exposure to the world outside of the community may be the cause of the gradual decline in Veneto use, and even its eventual disappearance. Some of the forms of exposure include TV, radio, magazines, and newspapers, which are broadcast and written in Spanish. The only language allowed in the Colegio Unión, the school in the community, is Spanish. Thus, students learn all discipline-specific terminology in Spanish. Moreover, they are prohibited from speaking Veneto in school (Zago Bronca, 2006). Barnes (2009), however, found that 83.3% of participants prefer to speak Veneto with their children and other members of the community. In contrast, only 6% prefer to use Spanish over Veneto in the community (p. 134).

To sum up, Veneto’s preservation in Chipilo is considered a rare transgenerational case of language maintenance. Due to historically relative isolation, homogeneity and language separation of domains, Veneto is still used and acquired in most bilingual homes. Therefore, this community presents an excellent source for investigating the contact-induced changes that occur during transgenerational maintenance, specifically in the domain of negation among bilingual speakers.

---

2 However, Wössner (2002) found a considerable percentage of Chipileños (90% of people age 10-25, 100% of people age 26-40, 90% of people age 41-60, and 88% age 61-85) who would like to have a Veneto radio station or newspaper (cited in Ibarra, 2011).
1.5 Research Questions

Using both variationist and experimental methods, this dissertation investigates the structure and frequency of negative doubling, as well as factors that contribute to the appearance of the phenomenon. More specifically, this project is driven by the following three questions:

1) What is the distribution of negative utterances including the final no (10) in the Spanish spoken in Chipilo, compared with the standard negation (9)? Is the frequency different according to each task?

(9)  

\[ El \ no \ va, \ (\¿no?) \]

He NEG goes NEG

‘He does not go, right?’

(10)  

\[ El \ no \ va \ no \]

He NEG goes NEG

‘He does not go’

2) What linguistic factors, if any, have a significant effect on the elicitation of negative doubling (ND) in Chipileño Spanish?

3) How do extralinguistic factors (sex, age, and parents’ ethnicity) affect ND in Chipilo?

By investigating these three questions, this dissertation explores and discusses the factors which play a crucial role in the transfer and use of a morphosyntactic phenomenon in a bilingual setting.

1.6 Organization of the Dissertation

The previous sections provided an essential background of the community, along with the limitations faced in studying morphosyntactic variation, and the three areas of major contributions made by the dissertation. Chapter 2 presents an overview of theories of language
transfer and contact-induced changes. Then, a discussion on types, causes, and outcomes of transfer in a bilingual setting is provided. This is followed by the specific situation of Chipileño Spanish, which includes discussion of four types of transfer from Veneto: prosodic, phonetic, lexical, and morphosyntactic. The chapter then discusses negation, followed by a review of the relevant previous literature on variation in negation in Romance varieties. What follows is the section on linguistic variables, which takes into consideration previous research and identifies similar variables for the current project. The dissertation’s research questions and corresponding hypotheses are then presented.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used to collect data for this study. Detailed information on the participants is provided, along with three social variables (sex, parents’ ethnicity, and age) and procedures used to collect data. The chapter continues with the explicit description of the four tasks that participants completed, followed by methods of data analysis, including coding procedures used for analysis of the distribution of negative doubling.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the four data collection tasks through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative results based on factors both social (sex, age, and parents’ ethnicity) and linguistic (negative mention in a preceding negative context, use of similar or different verb in an utterance, previous adjacent constituent, and use of other negative words). After establishing a general picture of negative doubling in Chipileño based on the group results, the dissertation presents individual results to compare and determine whether ND occurrence is dependent on task, dependent on the individual, or evenly distributed across the four tasks.

Chapter 5 interprets the results, presented in Chapter 4, according to the three research questions posed in Chapters 1 and 2. More specifically, the chapter summarizes the results from the current dissertation and compares them with the results from previous studies. Taking together both social and linguistic factors, the current project provides evidence of final no transfer from minority variety to majority language in the speech of bilingual speakers. Moreover, this dissertation finds additional support for the effect of social factors in elicitation of the morphosyntactic phenomenon, showing that males, specifically younger speakers with two Chipileño parents are more likely to produce the minority language (Veneto) feature ND in their majority language (Spanish).
The variation in ND use is discussed across sexes, parental ethnic backgrounds, age groups. Additionally, the discussion of which internal factors favour ND is provided.

The chapter closes with directions for future research and conclusions.
Chapter 2
Language change and transfer in morphosyntax

2.1 Overview

The goal of this chapter is to review the literature regarding negation and transfer in language contact situations, as well as to examine syntactic transfer and consider specifically the possibility of transfer in the domain of negation. The chapter is organized as follows. First, section 2.2 presents three major proposals on language contact variation and change, describing how languages change and what constrains the transfer of linguistic features from one language to another. Even though this project does not explicitly test any of these proposals, the findings of this dissertation will provide further evidence of the role of both external and internal factors when analyzing the transfer of final *no* from Veneto into Chipileño Spanish. This section includes a discussion on causes, types, and outcomes of transfer in a bilingual setting. Section 2.3 contextualizes the current study by providing examples of lexical, phonetic, prosodic, and morphosyntactic interference from Veneto into Spanish seen among bilingual speakers in Chipilo. These examples are essential to the overall discussion of the community and of the two languages in contact. Section 2.4 describes the general phenomenon of negation in order to support a discussion of its variation in Romance languages and cases of negative doubling and contact. Section 2.5 discusses the linguistic variables this study investigates. Finally, in light of the literature reviewed earlier in this chapter, section 2.6 examines the three research questions articulated in Chapter 1, followed by the three hypotheses that guide this investigation.
2.2 Language Contact and Transfer

A number of studies on simultaneous bilingual acquisition have shown that the acquisition of two languages from early ages is qualitatively similar to first language (L1) acquisition (Meisel, 2011). Certain crucial conditions, such as similarity in quality and input of two languages, prestige, and periods of exposure, enable speakers to fully master both languages. Such bilinguals tend to speak

…in grammatical sentences (except for the occasional slip of the tongue), will not omit or misplace morphemes, will recognize ambiguity and/or multiple interpretations and pragmatic implications of words and sentences, and will be attuned to their sociolinguistic environment (Benmamoun, Montrul, & Polinsky, 2013, p. 130).

However, while studying language contact situations and specifically when analysing transfer between two languages, a number of social factors (e.g., intensity of contact, duration of the contact period, number of speakers, socioeconomic dominance of one group over the other) and linguistic factors (e.g., universal markedness, typological differences, similarities between the languages) has to be taken into consideration (Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). In this dissertation, I adopt Weinreich’s (1953, p. 10) definition of linguistic interference, which is:

Those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e., as a result of language contact.

A result of such interference is often the mixture or fusion of the structures of two languages, accompanied by lexical, prosodic, and/or structural transfer. Many authors (King, 2012; Sánchez, 2005; Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Thomason, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988) have extensively debated how languages change, and which social and/or linguistic factors govern the transfer of linguistic features. Some linguists propose that language change in contact situations is governed by social factors (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Thomason, 2001, 2008, 2014). However, others argue that linguistic factors, specifically typological similarity between two
languages, is the primary determinant of language change (see Silva-Corvalán, 1994, 2001; Weinreich, 1953; Winford, 2003). Two of the most important proponents of language external or social influence are Thomason and Kaufman (1988), who state that “it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language change” (p. 35). According to their proposal, language change should be analyzed through social interaction of speakers first; linguistic factors are important but secondary when predicting language change.

Due to much debate and criticism, in a later work Thomason (2001) restates her proposal and claims that contact-induced change or “any linguistic change that is less likely to occur outside a particular contact situation is due at least in part to language contact” (pp. 62-63). With regard to structural changes, Thomason (2001) does not deny the importance of purely linguistic factors to a theory of language change. She furthermore suggests that typological congruence or typological matching, where one language adopts ‘foreign’ or outside structural elements, is possible only if two languages are structurally compatible (Silva-Corvalán, 1994, p. 134). This is a requisite for contact-induced structural change. In other words, the role of typological distance between two languages determines the extent of borrowing of certain linguistic features, but only under particular social circumstances. Thomason & Kaufman propose a borrowing scale, which determines the degree and type of borrowing or interference (lexical > phonological > structural) based on intensity of contact.³ For example, in casual contact only lexical borrowing occurs, due to the minimal cultural pressure from one group on the other (p. 77). In the case of intense contact, moderate to heavy structural borrowing usually occurs, including examples of new syllable structure, extensive word order changes, borrowed inflectional affixes, new categories, and phonetic changes including allophonic alternations; these and other changes result from the extensive cultural pressure of the dominant group (pp. 77-92). However, Thomason (2008) argues that even in contexts of intense or extreme contact, some speech communities, specifically those of many Native American languages, are resistant to borrowing and shift due to isolation or a strong sense of place and identity among the community (pp. 48-49). In contrast, speakers of stigmatised varieties can deliberately change structures of their idiolects, in order to create social identities (Thomason, 2008, p. 51). A few

³ According to Thomason & Kaufman (1988), borrowing only affects L1 by incorporating features from L2. In this dissertation, given that Chipileño speakers are bilingual from an early age, I propose that borrowing is interchangeable between Veneto and Spanish.
examples of deliberate change observations include French noun phrases combined with Cree verb phrases in Michif, the Aleut verbal root system incorporating Russian finite verb inflection in Mednyi Aleut, and Quechua grammar with Spanish vocabulary in Media Lengua (Thomason, 2008, pp. 51-52). Even though it is hard to prove that the changes in the above examples have occurred deliberately and not naturally, Thomason (2008) claims that these three examples can speak against the existence of absolute linguistic constraints, i.e., universal constraints based on structural comparability (Silva-Corvalán, 2001).

Unlike Thomason and Kaufman (1988), Silva-Corvalán (2001), among others, argues that “the speakers’ sociolinguistic history determines the linguistic outcome but the structures of the languages in contact determine what linguistic elements can be borrowed and how they will spread” (p. 270). Furthermore, she states that in order for a grammar to be permeable to a ‘foreign’ influence, there must be structural compatibility between two languages and “only those [linguistic features] that are compatible … with the structure of the borrowed language… will be adopted, disseminated, and passed on to new generations” (p. 134). In other words, she claims that two languages must share superficially parallel structures (e.g., word order) for the transfer to occur. In Spanish, for example, one of the most prominent word orders in broad focus sentences is S (Subject) V (Verb) O (Object), similar to Italian and Veneto.4

An early proposal by Weinreich (1953) also focuses on internal language change, which explains possible morphosyntactic transfer in a language contact situation according to three main factors. These factors are constraints based on congruence of morphological structures, constraints based on transparency, and constraints based on functional considerations (cited in Winford, 2003, p. 92). Weinreich (1953) claims that the transfer of morphemes is facilitated when two languages are typologically similar. This constraint is taken up in the proposals of both Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Silva-Corvalán (2001), who argue that the linguistic features of typologically similar languages have the highest chance to be transferred. The second constraint that Weinreich (1953) discusses is based on transparency. Weinreich (1953) states that “the fuller the integration of the morpheme, especially the one with complex grammatical functions, the less the likelihood of its transfer” (pp. 53-54). In other words, marked morphemes are less likely to be borrowed and transferred to another language. Winford (2003) reinforces

---

4 Word order is influenced by many factors, including type of sentence, type of verbs, noun characteristics, and others. For more discussion, refer to Fernández Soriano (1993).
Weinreich’s (1953) approach and argues that in a contact situation between typologically similar languages, congruence and transparency operate simultaneously (p. 95). Finally, Weinreich (1953) discusses the third constraint, which is based on functions and the existence of gaps in “the morphemic inventory of a recipient language, which facilitates the importation of the new morpheme and its functional category” (p. 96). In other words, transfer is possible if one language does not have a specific morpheme, which has a crucial function in the other language. As such, this constraint is the opposite of the first one, which requires pre-existing similarity between two languages. For example, Middle English borrowed the French suffix – *able*, which did not exist in English. As a result, it also adopted a functional meaning from French (Amsler, 1999, p. 225).

As for the present dissertation, both Spanish and Veneto are typologically similar languages and express negation similarly. Based on the proposals of Weinreich (1953), Silva-Corvalan (2001), and Thomason and Kaufman (1988), transfer between two typologically similar languages will be favoured. In other words, transfer of the final *no* from Veneto into Spanish is possible. As mentioned earlier, the final *no* in standard Spanish can only be a tag question with a rising contour, with the function of request for reconfirmation of the previous statement. In Veneto however, the final *no* is bound into a declarative clause with a falling contour. Its function is different from the one in Spanish: it is used in negative sentences to reaffirm the negation (C. Poletto, personal communication, January 30, 2016). In Spanish, this function is absent. Based on Weinreich’s (1953) third constraint, the gap in a recipient language favours the incorporation of a new morpheme. Therefore, it is possible to speak about the transfer of final *no* with Veneto prosody and function in bilingual speech.

In addition to external approaches to studying language-induced change, an internal approach has been presented by King (2000), who bases her argument on the Principles and Parameters framework of generative grammar. King (2000) claims that lexical items of all categories are borrowed first if these categories exist in the target language (King, 2000, p. 51). With regard to morphological or syntactic borrowing, King (2012) proposes that syntactic borrowing alone is not possible; rather, the lexical items are borrowed together with structural features. For example, King (2012) argues the process of addition of the affix – *able* from Latin into other Romance varieties and Germanic is purely lexical. She claims that the suffix initially was part of two adjectives ‘visible’ and ‘edible’, but over time, it started to attach to other similar adjectives.
(e.g., readable, legible) in Romance and Germanic varieties (p. 47). Another example comes from Canadian French, where the construction in (1) is often cited as transfer from English because in standard French, *avec ‘with’* should appear before *que ‘who’*:

(1)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Le gars</th>
<th>que</th>
<th>je sors</th>
<th>avec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the guy</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>I go out with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The guy I go out with’

In French, a preposition should have an adjacent lexical complement in order for the sentence to be grammatical (King, 2000, p. 47). However, King (2000) argues that similar examples as (1) are widespread in certain varieties of French that are not in contact with English. Moreover, as Bouchard (1982) mentions, a construction like (1) existed in 14th century French, which suggests that similar cases or ‘innovations’ were lexicalized at the earlier stages of the language (cited in King, 2000, p. 47).

If it is true that such transfer is initialized with the borrowing of lexical items, the possibility exists that in the case of Chipileño Spanish, the final *no* was borrowed as part of the Verb structure (V NEG) from Veneto into the Spanish of bilingual speakers. In standard Spanish, final *no* is ungrammatical, but the overall sequence in Veneto and Spanish is identical: (S) NEG V (O). If it is assumed that the final *no* has been lexicalized with a specific meaning and transferred to Spanish, it is possible to adopt King’s proposal (2012).

To sum up, we have discussed three different proposals with regard to language change and transfer. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Thomason (2001) explain language change through social factors, where linguistic factors take a secondary role. Silva-Corvalán (2001), on the other hand, argues that linguistic and not social factors determine the outcome of the language contact and change. Finally, King (2000) claims that language change happens internally in the lexicon, where structural changes are seen as part of lexical borrowing.

### 2.2.1 Consequences of contact-induced language changes
Today, there are many bilingual and bicultural communities, whose languages are either co-official or have a prestigious status (e.g., the situation of French and English in Canada, Spanish and Catalan in Catalonia, Spain; and the use of French, German, Italian and Romansch in Switzerland). However, the situation of immigrant languages can be different. Typically, the dominant group promotes its patterns of language use as the model required for social advancement and the use of dialects or minority languages reduces the opportunity for success in society. Exposure to the media, education, and industry in the dominant language causes gradual attrition of the minority languages. As a result, minority groups often lean towards dialect levelling, (Trudgill, 1986), in a context in which multiple varieties of a language come into contact with another language, such as in the situation of Spanish in the US. Another consequence of a contact situation is the adoption of the dominant cultural and language features through linguistic accommodation (Giles, Taylor & Bourhis, 1973), which helps L2 learners gain social mobility in mainstream society. Their first language is then usually left behind and lost within two to three generations of speakers. Milroy (1987), however, argues that if the minority variety constitutes a crucial part of the community, accommodation is not an option; language maintenance can be enforced through dense, multiplex social networks (Milroy & Gordon, 2003) and domains5 (Fishman, 1980) in which the minority languages continue to be used and disseminated to future generations of speakers (Johnstone, 2010, p. 388). This last consequence has been one of the reasons of Veneto’s preservation in Chipilo.

2.2.2 Relationship between two languages in a single community

Most studies indicate that stable bilingualism is most likely to occur in situations of diglossia, a specific relationship between two or more varieties of the same language in which their use in a speech community is distributed to different functions (Ferguson, 1972, p. 232). The most

---

5 “Domain” is a sociocultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community, in such a way that “individual behavior and social patterns can be distinguished from each other and yet related to each other” (Fishman 1966, p. 442).
important hallmark of diglossia is the functional specialization of high and low varieties. Specifically, a high variety is used for out-group and formal communication, whereas a low variety is used for in-group, informal and familiar interactions (Ferguson, 1972; Fishman, 1980). A low variety is typically acquired as a language for use at home, whereas a high variety is never learned at home but rather later through socialization at school. Furthermore, a high variety is supported by institutions and is the only variety used in formal institutions, such as schools, government, and the church. According to Ryan, Giles, and Sebastian (1982), one’s ethnic language is much more likely to survive emigration from the mother country if the minority languages or low variety continues to be used across most situations, with a variety of interlocutors (p. 4).

### 2.2.3 Causes of transfer

Most regional languages and dialects, as well as most immigrant and indigenous languages in nations across the world have been declining in vitality over the years due to the pressures for homogeneity and monolingualism (Ryan, Giles & Sebastian 1982, p. 5). There are many causes that can lead to transfer from one language, usually the minority variety, to another, most often the majority language. These causes fall under two major categories: internal or linguistic, and external or social. With regard to the linguistic factors, typological similarity between the two languages is a prerequisite for contact-induced change. If languages are typologically similar, there is a higher chance for transfer to occur on the lexical, phonological, and even structural levels (Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Winford, 2003). Most often, internal factors are accompanied by external influence. Grosjean (1982) suggests a number of factors that affect language maintenance or its shift to another language (pp. 107-110). Some of the these include social aspects (e.g., size of group, isolation from other minority languages or home country, intermarriages, geographical concentration and mobility within the family, people’s occupation, and education policies within the community), attitudes between the two groups or towards their own group, use of language (e.g., its domains, function, and interlocutors), and other factors (e.g., cultural support, assimilative power, or majority group). For example, negative attitudes towards the minority language or a prestigious status of the dominant language in contrast to a
stigmatized status of the minority language can lead to transfer and further attrition of the minority language, as can other political and economic factors that affect people’s perception of their first language. Moreover, geographical factors and a small community size can lead to a gradual assimilation towards the dominant culture (Trudgill, 1986). On the other hand, if the group is relatively large and close-knit (e.g., Germans in Ohio and Texas, Mexicans in Los Angeles and San Antonio, Puerto Ricans in New York), there is a higher degree of language maintenance (Grosjean, 1982).

It is therefore important to stress the fact that in linguistic interference or transfer, linguists should focus on studying the interplay between “both structural and non-structural factors that promote or impede such interference and lead to transfer from one language to another” (Weinreich, 1953, p. 5).

2.2.4 Types of transfer using Thomason and Kaufman (1988) borrowing scale

Thomason and Kaufman (1988) propose a borrowing scale, which is related to their framework for contact-induced change. As seen in Figure 1.2, language contact can either lead to language shift of L1 to the target language (TL) or language maintenance of the L1. The intensity of two languages in contact is one of the main predictors of language maintenance. As Thomason and Kaufman (1988) suggest, casual contact between the two languages only leads to lexical borrowing, specifically the borrowing of non-basic vocabulary for cultural and functional reasons (p. 74); relatively intense contact can lead to phonological borrowing; however, more intense contact can result not only in borrowings from the lexicon and phonology but also in moderate to heavy structural changes in the L1, which can eventually lead to language loss. The next subsections describe these types of borrowing in more detail by focusing on other possible factors that contribute to transfer of specific features.
Figure 1.2: Borrowing scale of contact-induced change (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p. 50)
2.2.4.1 Lexical Transfer

Lexical transfer is related to vocabulary borrowing from one language to another (Weinreich, 2011). Usually, the lexical items that are necessary for everyday use and/or are culturally important in one language and absent in another are transferred first (Sanchez, 2005; Weinreich, 2011). These can include interjections, expressions that express emotions (e.g., “Oh my God”, “thank God”), and necessary noun terminology (Weinreich, 2011, pp. 52-54). Furthermore, some of the words are transferred because of the social prestige that they carry semantically. This reason is especially common among younger speakers who use foreign words in order to sound ‘cool’ (Weinreich, 2011). Finally, lexical transfer is affected by the typological relationship between two languages: transfer often occurs if the two languages in contact share the same ancestor, and therefore have ‘common’ vocabulary (e.g., Spanish and Portuguese or Spanish and Italian). The situation in Chipilo is a perfect example of typological congruence and transfer from Spanish to Veneto and vice versa, since both of the varieties are Indo-European Romance languages.

2.2.4.2 Phonological transfer

As shown in Figure 1.2 (see section 2.2.4), phonological borrowing is predicted in cases of relatively intense contact. Phonological transfer occurs through lexical borrowing, which carries foreign sounds and phonemes (Winford, 2003). Two possible constraints favour phonological borrowing, as seen in (2) and (3):

(2) *The existence of gaps in the phonemic inventory of the recipient language facilitates the importation of new phonemes or phonemic oppositions that fill such gaps.*

(3) *Borrowing of phonological rules is facilitated when such changes do not affect the basic phonemic inventory and are restricted to patterns of allophonic distribution.*

(Winford, 2003, pp. 55-56)
Based on the first constraint, borrowing occurs when one of the languages lacks the phonemic category. For example, Middle English borrowed the contrast between voiced /v/ and voiceless /f/ fricatives from French via loanwords (e.g., veal vs. feel) (Winford, 2003, pp. 54-55). In the case of Chipilo, little research has been conducted concerning phonological transfer. Some phonetic and phonological features have been transferred into Spanish of bilingual speakers (see section 2.3.2). Among bilinguals fluent in both Spanish and Veneto, the confusion of ‘foreign’, i.e., Spanish sounds usually occurs between trill and tap sounds ([ɾ] vs. [ɾ]), which exist in Veneto and Spanish (Barnes, 2009; MacKay, 2002). In Veneto, /ɾ/ has three allophones: a trill, which occurs in the initial position or before another consonant; a tap, which only occurs in the intervocalic position; and a voiceless trill, which occurs in the final position (refer to MacKay, 2002, pp. 47-48). In contrast, in Spanish, both sounds (tap and trill) are present in the intervocalic position, so native speakers make a distinction between perro ‘dog’ and pero ‘but’. However, Chipileños often produce /ɾ/ in place of /tɾ/ when speaking Spanish. Therefore, they borrow the phonological rule from their L1 and apply it in the recipient language.

2.2.4.3 Structural Transfer

Similar to phonological transfer, morphological transfer occurs through lexical borrowing in intense contact situations. In English morphology, for example, prefixes as well as noun, adjectival, and verbal suffixes were borrowed from French (see Dalton-Puffer, 1996). Inflectional morphemes were also adopted from Greek and Latin languages. According to Dalton-Puffer (1996), borrowing can also occur when morphemes are semantically and morphosyntactically transparent. In other words, the elements borrowed into another language have to coincide in meaning and in phonological shape with another language (cited in Winford, 2003, p. 58). Thus, the morphemes that are similar in pronunciation to those of another language, and that correspond to the same semantic meaning they hold in the other language, have a higher chance to get borrowed and retained in the recipient language.

Another possibility for borrowing can be to fill a grammatical gap, a structure which is absent in the recipient language (Sanchez, 2005, p.7). In Chipileño Spanish, structural transfer has been
attested in previous literature and is heard in bilingual speech (Barnes, 2009). The two most noticeable ones include the use of indirect object clitics (e.g., le ‘him/her’ is used for both singular and plural forms) and redundant possessive articles (see section 2.3.3), which are ungrammatical in the Mexican variety of Spanish. Since in Veneto those two elements are grammatically appropriate and are associated to similar meaning, speakers seem to transfer them into Spanish. Final no, which forms part of negative doubling, is absent in Spanish but possible in Veneto. Since final no is appropriate in some contexts, there is a possibility that negative doubling can be a case of structural transfer, with final no filling a gap in Spanish. This dissertation investigates the contexts and frequency of use of the phenomenon, and addresses the findings in detail in Chapter 5.

2.2.5 Outcome of Transfer

Keeping in mind possible factors that lead to feature transfer from one language to another, three possible outcomes of contact-induced change have been identified: language maintenance, fusion between minority and majority languages usually leading to the emergence of new structures and even a variety, and finally, language attrition or loss.

2.2.5.1 Language maintenance

It has been argued that a language represents a critical domain for assessing acculturation because it is a socially salient indicator of cultural difference and a marker of ethnic boundaries (Alba, Logan, Lutz, & Stults, 2002, p. 468). Typically, if a group is emotionally attached to a language and has pride in its literary and cultural heritage, it will make the most effort to pass it on to new generations. A case of prototypical microbilingualism is the Welsh community in Trelew, in the Chubut Valley of Argentina, whose speakers preserved its language for over a century (Coupland & Garrett, 2010; Lipski, 2003a). In the early years of settlement, the
community had its own system of educational, political and religious institutions – factors that contributed to Welsh language preservation. After World War II, the Argentinian government pushed for a monolingual policy, making Welsh a stigmatized variety to be spoken at home and associated with an agricultural way of living (Coupland & Garrett, 2010, pp. 8-9). In the mid 20th century, the community celebrated its centenary and aimed to revive its cultural and linguistic values. Although today Welsh has practically disappeared from Patagonia, a small percentage of speakers still use Welsh informally and can take it as a subject at school.

Another factor which contributes to language preservation is the group’s attitude towards their language. Myers-Scotton (2002) argues that “individual attitudes towards the group’s ethnolinguistic vitality contribute directly to his/her desire to maintain the language tied to the group’s social identity” (p. 51). Italy today, for example, represents a case of migratory polycentrism where the total immigration exceeds two million people, predominantly from Romania, Albania, and Morocco. In many of those communities, particularly Arabic-speaking ones, there was an emergence of a diglossic relationship due to their positive attitudes and loyalty towards their first language. Today, Arabic is still used and acquired in many bilingual homes. Ryan (1979) furthermore states that, “the value of language as a chief symbol of group identity is one of the major forces for the preservation of non-standard speech styles of dialects” (cited in Gardner, 1982, p. 147). Moreover, Ryan argues that in order “to maintain some speech styles distinct from that of other ethnic groups,” it is crucial “to maintain their own identity” (cited in Gardner, 1982, p. 142).

In summary, to better investigate language status in a bilingual community, it is crucial to distinguish the domains of language use. Positive attitudes and the degree of language use are useful indicators of minority language preservation and sustained bilingualism. In the case of Chipilo, previous research has found positive attitudes of speakers towards Veneto use and its extensive use in the community (see Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2012). In fact, these are some major reasons that led to Veneto language maintenance in the community.

2.2.5.2 Fusion of two language systems
Another possible outcome of long-term contact between two languages is the fusion of two systems and the emergence of a hybrid language (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Winford, 2003). One of the examples is Media Lengua in Ecuador, which mixes a Spanish lexicon and Quechua grammatical structure (Winford, 2003, p. 19). Another common example, which rises when multiple languages are in contact, is a pidgin, a variety with minimal vocabulary and structure that emerged because of trade relations between European and indigenous tribes in the 19th century. Usually pidgin languages lack inflectional morphology, tense, mood, aspect verbal systems, movement and dominance rules, embedding strategies, and other aspects associated with fully developed languages (Winford, 2003, p. 20). However, there is a possibility that a restricted, simplified pidgin can lead to an extended pidgin and become a creole, a mixed language, which is a combination of a European lexicon(s) and indigenous base (e.g., Haitian Creole). Unlike a pidgin language, which does not have a community of native speakers, a creole is a developed language, acquired and passed on to new generations of speakers. These are possible outcomes of languages in contact.

The situation in Italy can also be treated as a case of fusion (e.g., Berruto, 2005; Cerruti, 2014; Ghimenton, 2013). In her analysis on Veneto language usage, Ghimenton (2013, 2015) claims that the relationship between standard Italian and the dialect, Veneto, no longer represents a case of diglossia, but rather dilalia, a situation where the prestigious variety (Italian) is used in both formal and informal contexts (Ghimenton, 2013, p. 110). As a result, due to the structural similarity between the Veneto dialects and Italian, bilingual Veneto-Italian speakers tend to mix the two languages in the same utterance using cognates. It is important to note, however, that Veneto is still a language that conveys cultural and regional belonging used in the interaction among adults for the most part, whereas Italian is a fundamental language used in the interaction between adults and children. In other words, Veneto is still transmitted and maintained due to a strong oral and regional tradition (Ghimenton, 2015, p. 124).

In terms of fusion between the two languages in Chipilo, it is interesting to note that even though Spanish and Veneto have been extensively used in the community, they are used in different domains, so bilinguals speak the two languages in distinct situations (see section 1.4.2). As a result, up until today, there have not been any studies mentioning the fusion of the two languages and the emergence of a new variety. However, from personal observations and Barnes’ (2009) data, bilingual speakers often code-switch between the two languages in the
conversation. In Barnes’ informal conversations with participants, bilingual speakers mention that code-mixing happens, especially among younger speakers who cannot think of a word in Veneto on the spot, and therefore, insert a Spanish equivalent.

2.2.5.3 Language Loss

Even though identification with a language and positive attitudes are crucial factors in language preservation, they do not guarantee minority language maintenance in a well-defined diasporic society (Romaine, 1995, p. 43). Immigrants who move to another country for economic reasons tend to lose their native language. As Kegl (1975) writes,

... At the time when I was acquiring language (sic), speaking a second language such as Slovene was looked down upon as detrimental to one’s ability to speak either language well and as an indication of one’s immigrant background.

(cited in Grosjean, 1982, p. 110)

A relevant example, which demonstrates the loss of the first language and the shift to the dominant language, is a case of a Slovenian-German bilingual community in a remote part of Austria’s Gail Valley (cited in Milroy & Gordon, 2003). The members in the community had been traditionally embedded in close-knit networks of mutual support (neighbors, friends, and co-workers) that socialized in their language in their community due to their rural farming lifestyle. When the economy shifted from one dependent on subsistence farming to one of service, the local support network diminished and brought change into personal social network structures. Farmers started selling products to incomers and to big factories rather than to local farmers. As a result, farming facilities were converted into tourist areas. Ultimately, because of the very close contact with the outsiders, the villagers adopted new language forms, which gradually led to a loss of their L1 (Milroy & Gordon, 2003, p. 125). This has also been the case among Czechs and Slovaks in the US in the 19th century, who lost their language due to prestige.

---

6 Milroy and Gordon (2003) state that “close-knit networks are social mechanisms that support the construction, maintenance, and elaboration of local linguistic distinctiveness … in the absence of institutional support” (pp. 132-133).
concerns and economic factors (McCabe, 2016). In the past, most Czech immigrant families who settled in relatively isolated rural areas did not speak English; therefore, their language was used as an essential tool of everyday life and a crucial part of intergenerational communication (McCabe 2016, p. 185). The situation since then has significantly changed, and today’s families find it harder to retain their minority language due to the power and the prestige of English and low status of their language.

Unlike the aforementioned examples, Veneto has been preserved for over six generations of speakers and today is still acquired and extensively used in the Chipilo community as the first language among most bilingual families. However, as previous research shows (Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2012), many words have been lost during the past decades, due to changes in lifestyle and economic shifts. Many speakers believe that due to the intense contact with monolingual Mexicans, the Veneto language may be lost in the future due to extensive borrowings from Spanish. The next section, however, presents an overview of three types of transfer attested in the bilingual Chipileño speech. In spite of the fact that Veneto is a minority language in Mexico, feature transfer has been shown from Veneto to the Spanish of these bilinguals. I provide examples of lexical, phonetic and structural transfer to show the influence of the minority language on the majority language.

2.3 Transfer in Chipileño Spanish

2.3.1 Lexical Transfer

As discussed in §2.2, a common effect of contact between majority and minority languages occurs at the lexical level (King, 2000; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). Barnes (2009) identified the cases of lexical transfer from Veneto into Spanish in her collected interviews. A few of the

7 Previously, most Chipileños worked in agriculture. Today, many young speakers study outside of the community and work in other industries. Therefore, certain agricultural and household terms have been lost.
examples include use of *barba* for ‘uncle’ and *yeya* for ‘aunt’, instead of their counterparts *tío* and *tía*, respectively. Also, the verb *hacer* ‘to do/to make’ in Spanish has been extended semantically to mean ‘to say/to tell’, due to the pattern in Veneto where *far* ‘to make/to do’ can be used instead of *dir* ‘to say/to tell’.

(4) *Y le hago [digo] “cálmate que soy tu novia”. Así le hago desmadre también a él. Me hace [dice] “lárgate de aquí que me corras a las viejas”*

‘And I said to him “calm down, I am your girlfriend”. I mess around with him like that too. He says to me “get away from here, you are chasing away all the chicks [girls]”’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 176)

Borrowing from Veneto into Spanish has also been identified in terms of discourse markers, such as *mo* and *po*, used for emphasis and exclamation.

(5) *Mira mo*

look *mo*

‘Look’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 181)

*Po* is more common in Chipileño speech when expressing surprise or emphasizing the phrase, as in the frozen expression in (6):

(6) *Utu pó*

you.believe reinforcing interjection

‘Can you believe it?’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 181)

*Po* has also extended its meaning to refer to its counterpart *pues* ‘then/well’ in Spanish.

(7) *Pues no sé. Sería un payaso, po. Pues no se ve en un espejo.*
‘Well, I do not know. He would be a clown, *po*. Well, he does not look at himself in the mirror’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 182)

In sum, interlingual influence from Veneto into Spanish has been observed with lexical items, exclamative and emphatic particles.

### 2.3.2 Phonological and Prosodic Transfer

Phonological transfer has also been detected in the speech of Chipileños when speaking Spanish. In (8), Barnes (2009) reports the neutralization of /ɾ/ and /r/ observed in the speech of Chipileños.


‘The highway. The highway they say. Like, they change it. Sometimes it has two r’s and they put one, and where it has one they put two’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 1)

Yet, one of the first noticeable traits that marks Chipileño speech is intonation, which makes bilingual speakers sound more *Italian* (Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2012; Tararova, 2014). The following excerpt is taken from Barnes’s (2009) spontaneous interview with a Chipileño, who pointed out on his ‘foreign’ accent:

(9) *En mi escuela dicen que tengo acento. Tienes un acento extrañ o que no eres, dicen, no eres mexicano. Yo sí. Dicen no porque tienes un acento extraño... Que, me dijeron que alargo las vocales.*
‘At my school they tell me I have an accent. You have a strange accent, you aren’t, they say, you aren’t Mexican. Yes, I am. They say no because you have a strange accent… That, they tell me I lengthen the vowels’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 195)

Barnes & Michnowicz (2013) analyzed prenuclear F0 peak alignment in Spanish and in Veneto in declarative sentences using naturalistic data from eight bilingual Chipileño participants. In most Spanish varieties, a F0 peak is aligned with an accented vowel so that the fall is realized on the post-tonic syllable, whereas in Veneto, the peak alignment occurs earlier as the fall is realized on the tonic syllable, similar to other Italian varieties. Their results indicated 53% of cases with early peak alignment in Spanish, which suggests language-contact influence from Veneto into Spanish. The use of early peaks was significantly more frequent among younger females, compared to older generations. Barnes and Michnowicz (2013) suggest that one of the main explanations for such differences may be to ‘enhance their “Italianness” as a way to distinguish themselves from the mainstream culture’ (p. 120). In a more recent controlled study, Barnes & Michnowicz (2015) found that earlier peak alignment was present in the speech of five bilingual participants out of a total of 17 speakers. Similar to Barnes & Michnowicz (2013), Barnes & Michnowicz (2015) showed the preference of the younger group, specifically females, to mark earlier peak alignment on verbs in second position (Subject–Verb). Both of these studies suggest possible convergence of two prosodic systems, Spanish and Veneto, in the discourse of some bilingual speakers.

In sum, several studies (Barnes, 2009; Barnes & Michnowicz, 2013; Barnes & Michnowicz, 2015) have shown possible phonological and prosodic transfer effects from Veneto into the Spanish of bilingual speakers.

### 2.3.3 Morphosyntactic transfer
Aside from lexical and phonological transfer, morphosyntactic transfer from Veneto has also been widely detected in Chipileño Spanish, specifically with indirect object clitics and redundant possessive articles (Barnes, 2009, pp. 199-213). Bilingual Chipileño speakers, in contrast to monolingual Mexican speakers (DeMello, 1992), regularly use the singular form le ‘him/her’ for both singular and plural third person dative pronouns (rather than le and les for singular and plural, respectively).8

(10)  *Y ya a Miguel no le costó mucho, pero a las niñas sí. A mis hijas sí le costó mucho.*

‘And it was not that hard for Miguel, but it was for my daughters. It was very difficult for them [my daughters].’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 200)

One of the possible reasons for the non-standard use is the transfer from Veneto of the indirect object clitic, which does not mark number.

(11)  *Gia ghe [3SG.DAT] ho dit a me fradel e l me ha dit ke si. Sta sera su da la junta al ghe [3PL.DAT] avixa de sto mistier a cuei atri del grupo.*

‘I told my brother and he said yes. This afternoon at the meeting he will advise the others in the group about the work’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 201)

As seen in the Veneto example in (11), the same indirect object pronoun appears for both singular and plural third person. Although this phenomenon is found in Spanish varieties other than Chipileño (Hualde, 2005; Lipski, 1994), its prevalence in Chipileño Spanish among bilinguals only can be connected with the fact that plurality is not marked in the corresponding dative pronoun in Veneto.

Another feature common in bilingual speech is the use of redundant possessive determiners, as in (12):

---

8 The phonetic elision of /s/ has also been attested in most of the Caribbean varieties (see Terrell, 1979; Lynch, 2009, for discussion on Cuban Spanish). However, in Mexico, the phoneme /s/ is usually retained (see Hualde, 2005; Lipski, 1994).
(12) *Pero sus papás de mi mamá sí vinieron de Italia*

but her parents of my mother yes came from Italy

‘But her parents did come from Italy’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 201)

In standard Spanish, the co-occurrence of the possessive determiner *sus* and the possessive *de*-phrase *de mi mamá* is considered ungrammatical; instead the first possessive determiner should be a plural definite article: *los papás de mi mamá*. According to Barnes’s (2009) observations, the phenomenon occurs mainly with the third person, “where the possessor may be ambiguous unless clarified through the discourse” (p. 201). However, it is interesting that bilingual speakers also use redundant possessive determiners with first person plural *nuestro* ‘our’, as in (13), which is not ambiguous.

(13) *Era nuestro pariente de nosotros*

was our relative of ours

‘He was our relative’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 202)

Although the presence of doubling possessive determiners is common in some other varieties of Spanish, Barnes suggests that the redundant use can be due to their occurrence in Veneto, which follows the pattern POSS-N-PP (p. 202).

(14) *So popá de ela*

her dad of she

‘Her dad’

(Barnes, 2009, p. 202)

In sum, some characteristics of Chipileño Spanish may have resulted from transfer from Veneto, including redundant use of possessive determiners and the use of the pronoun *le* for both singular and plural third person dative pronouns.
2.3.3.1 Negation in Chipilo

There has not been extensive work done on dialectal variation of negation in Spanish in general (Cuervo & Mazarro, 2013). Furthermore, negation in Chipilo has not been studied in depth as of yet. However, in the dictionary of Veneto spoken in Chipilo, MacKay (2002) mentions three forms of negation:

(15)  a. No       l’è       grande
      no       it is       big

b. No       l’è       grande no
      no       it is       big       NEG

c. No       l’è       mía grande
      no       it is       NEG       big

‘It is not big’

The examples in (15) suggest that (a) - (c) are all variants of the same variable; (a) is canonical, and is similar to Spanish, and (b) and (c) are cases of ND, where (b) contains the same negator in its preverbal position and sentence finally, while (c) contains a preverbal negator no and a postverbal negator mía. However, even though MacKay does not provide any information about the frequency of use of each variant, she mentions that ND occurs in Chipilo for reinforcement of the sentential negation, based on the following description:

La negazione no, usata prima del verbo, è spesso accompagnata da una particella rafforzativa; quest’ultima può spesso essere un altro no (dopo la frase verbale), oppure mía ‘mica’ (dopo del verbo). (MacKay 2002, p. 82)

‘The negation “no”, used preverbally, is often accompanied by a reinforcing particle; this particle can often be another “no” (after the verb phrase) or “mía” (after the verb).’
Barnes (2009) also briefly mentions the phenomenon of ND, which she suggests occurs frequently among bilingual speakers. During spontaneous interviews, Chipileños used ND in Veneto (16) and in Spanish (17), both postverbally and sentence finally:

(16)  -  *Fursi Daniel no l pol no, ma dente de la casa de la cultura al pol éser que sí* (p. 205)

‘Maybe Daniel cannot, but people from the Cultural Center might be able to’

(17)  -  *Cuéntale lo que me dijiste un día que le dijiste a mi nono*

‘Tell her what you told me one day about what you told my grandfather’

-  *No, no*

‘No, no’

-  *¿No qué?*

‘No what?’

-  *No, ¿para qué?*

‘No, why?’

-  *Eso lo puse en mi nueva novela, te tengo que decir.*

‘I put it in my new novel, I have to tell you’

-  *No, no lo pones en la novela no. Porque no te lo cuento.*

‘No, do not put it in your novel NEG. Because I won’t tell you’

(Barnes, 2009, pp. 205-206)

Also, as shown below, Barnes (2009) provides two spectrograms of a sentence in Veneto and the corresponding one in Spanish.
As seen in Figures 2.1 and 2.2, both sentences have similar F0 falling contour (H*L%). Given that the use of the final no is considered ungrammatical in standard Spanish, Barnes (2009) suggests that the final no has been transferred into Chipileño Spanish with the same prosody. However, she also mentions examples of final negation as tag questions that are realized with the rising contour (L*LH% or LH%). In Spanish, such cases are possible, but should be treated neither as ND nor as borrowings from Veneto.

In previous work, I analyzed ND in the discourse of seven bilingual Chipileño participants in Spanish using semi-spontaneous interviews from the corpus of Tararova (2012). The study examined the effects of both linguistic and social factors and revealed a few cases of ND.

---

9 Mexican Spanish is also known for circumflex final pattern, associated with a rising pitch of the nuclear accented syllable followed by a sharp fall at the edge (Butragueño & Prieto, 2010; Sosa, 1999).
Fourteen cases with two negators were found out of 150 occurrences of negative contexts in total among females in the older group. After conducting an acoustic analysis, these cases were divided into two different contours: six cases with the final *no* with a falling contour (a characteristic of ND), and eight cases with the final *no* with a rising contour (a characteristic of a tag question). ND occurred with a verb as the immediately preceding element, as in (18), and negation previously mentioned in discourse, as in (19).

(18) \[\text{No se mezclan no} \]
\begin{align*}
\text{NEG refl- mix NEG} \\
\text{‘They do not mix with each other’}. \\
\end{align*}

(Chipileño female, aged 55+)

As seen in (18), the verb *mezclar* ‘mix’ is used immediately preceding a final *no*. Example (19) shows the use of ND following a sentence with SN. *No* in *no tienes ganas de vender* ‘you do not have any desire to sell’ is the first negative mention, since there is no preceding explicit negation. *No pasamos no* ‘we do not fit NEG’ is an example of ND, where final *no* is used as a second negative mention following the preceding negative phrase. In other words, second negative mention seems to condition the distribution of ND in (19) (see pg. 76 for more discussion).

(19) \[\text{Pues varias veces también, vamos así a alguna tienda o algo y nos avientan las cosas. Y pues, “No tienes ganas de vender”, les decimos, “¿No tienes ganas de vender? ¿porque nos estás tratando mal?, No es que esto que…” Pero es como que no pasamos no.} \]

‘Well, many times we also go to a store or something like that and they [Mexicans] throw things at us. And well, “you do not have any desire to sell,” we tell them, “Do you \textbf{NEG have any desire to sell}?” “Why are you treating us badly?” “No, it is not that…” But it is like we do \textbf{not} fit NEG.’

(Chipileño female, aged 55+)
Another use of ND was found in the dialogue context where one speaker, after listening to another one, agreed and reinforced the idea of the previous negation, as in (20).

(20) Participant 1: Por los que se sienten españoles o algo así, y no tienen ni maíz.

‘And those who feel they are Spanish or something like that, they do not even have corn’.

Participant 2: Porque les da vergüenza decir que son Pérez, que son López, que son... Pero ¿por qué? Este... ¡Siéntete orgulloso! ¿Por qué se avergüenzan?

‘It is because they feel ashamed to say they are Perez, Lopez or... But why? Umm, feel proud of yourself! Why are you ashamed?’

Participant 1: Ándale... pero no te lo aceptan no, yo soy español o francés... y son López y Pérez. Y esos apellidos están hasta debajo de las piedras.

‘Exactly, but they do not accept it NEG, I am Spanish or French and they are Lopez or Perez. And these last names are everywhere/all over the place’

(Chipileño female, 55+)

ND in both examples (19) and (20) happens only after a negated clause (SN) with a pragmatic function of restatement of the first negative mention.

In sum, there are two variants of negation in Chipileño Spanish. One has falling intonation (ND), and the other is a standard variant, with either one preverbal negator or two, but where the second must be a tag with a rising contour (SN). In the 2012 pilot study, females used ND more than males, which supports the general trend of gender differences in speech. More specifically, gender differences may be attributed to women’s use of ND as an innovative marker of constructing social differences and being different to males (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 2003, Labov 2001).

With regard to the linguistic factors, ND was favoured in contexts immediately after the verb and upon a second negative mention. While ND was not the focus in Tararova (2012), the present study investigates this phenomenon directly. In order to analyze negation in Chipileño
Spanish, it is crucial to discuss the syntactic nature of negation and describe negative variation in Romance languages and languages in contact. This will allow me to later compare ND in Chipileño Spanish with other Romance languages.

2.4 Negation

2.4.1 Syntax of Negation

The term ‘negation’ refers to the idea of opposing or contradicting something affirmative (Sánchez López, 1999; Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2008; RAE, 2010). Two types of negation have been identified: external or sentential negation, and internal negation. External negation has scope over the entire sentence, as in (21):

(21) [Juan no viene a casa]

Juan NEG come-3SG to house

‘Juan is not coming home’.

The example in (21) is interpreted as follows: It is not the case that Juan is coming home. In other words, the scope is not over one specific constituent, but rather on the whole sentence. Internal negation, on the other hand, only negates one constituent or specific part of the sentence, as in (22).

(22) Juan no viene [a casa], sino a la fiesta directamente.

Juan NEG comes to house, but to the party directly

‘Juan is not coming home, but going directly to the party’
In (22), the scope of negation is narrower than in (20) because it negates only a specific constituent, the locative ‘a casa’. The sentence does not mean that ‘Juan is not coming at all’ but rather that he is not coming to the house: the focus lies on contrasting two places ‘house’ and ‘the party’.

Sentences with two or more negative elements can vary in their interpretation. In order to deal with these cases, Zeijlstra (2004) proposes a distinction between syntactic and semantic negation (p. 243). Semantic negation refers to the contexts where every negative element corresponds one-to-one to a negative operator; in other words, each negator receives a negative reading. In this case, a sentence with two semantic negations receives a double negation reading, as in standard English in (23).

(23) I do **not** like **nothing** → I like **something**

According to (23), ‘nothing’ becomes ‘something’ as the sentence is interpreted: ‘It is not the case that I like nothing’. In other words, ‘not’ and ‘nothing’ cancel each other out and yield an affirmative interpretation to the sentence. Moreover, there is no syntactic agreement or a feature checking relation between different negative elements in a sentence. Languages like Standard English exhibit this double negation reading.

Syntactic negation, on the other hand, refers to the concept of morphologically negative elements, which mark the presence of a negative operator (Zeijlstra, 2004, p. 243). This means that there is only one negative operator that licenses the rest of the elements, which are syntactically marked for negation. The phenomenon where negative elements yield a single semantic negation is called negative concord (Zeijstra, 2007, p. 504), as shown in (24).

(24) *No me gusta nada*

    **NEG me like nothing**

    ‘I do not like anything’

In (24), the preverbal negator *no* is the main negative operator that licenses the other negative elements in the sentence.
In other words, the main difference between syntactic and semantic negation lies in a feature checking relation between elements in negative concord languages, but not in the languages with double negation reading. The languages in which multiple negative elements are interpreted as if there were only one are called negative concord languages. Spanish and Italian are examples of negative concord languages.

2.4.2 Variation in Romance Languages

With respect to variation in negation, Zeijlstra (2007) proposes that “a universal property of natural language is that every language is able to express negation … but it differs to quite a large extent as to how each language expresses this negation” (p. 498). Zeijlstra (2007) uses the word ‘extent’ to refer to cross-linguistic variation in the form of the negative element, the position of the negative element, and its interpretation. It can also be applied to diachronic change: the three stages of Jespersen’s (1917) negation cycle, which focuses on the form and the position of the negators. The Jespersen cycle refers to a cyclical process, by which negative markers or sentence negators weaken, strengthen, and/or are replaced by another negative marker in a specific historical period (Bernini & Ramat, 1996; Zanuttini, 1997; Schwenter, 2006; Zeijlstra, 2007; Biberauer & Cyrino, 2009b). In his analysis of English, French, and Danish, Jespersen (1917) identified three stages or types of sentential negation to demonstrate how this process occurs:

Phase 1: \( \text{NEG I: NEG + Verb} \)
Phase 2: \( \text{NEG II: NEG + Verb + NEG} \)
Phase 3: \( \text{NEG III: Verb + NEG} \)

As seen above, the position of the negators corresponds to each phase of the cycle. Romance languages, such as Spanish, standard Portuguese, Romanian, and standard Italian form part of the first phase, in which negation occurs preverbally.
(25) Spanish:  
Juan  
no  
habla  
por teléfono
Juan NEG speaks on phone

(26) Romanian:  
Juan  
nu  
vorbește  
la telefon
Juan NEG speaks on the phone

(27) Portuguese:  
Juan  
não  
fala  
 ao telephone
Juan NEG speaks on the phone

(28) Italian:  
Juan  
non  
parla  
al telefono
Juan NEG speaks on the phone

English  ‘Juan does not talk on the phone’

As seen in (25-28), the negator precedes the finite verb. The other two Romance languages, French and Catalan, known for ND, occupy Phase 2 of the Jespersen cycle.

(29) French:  
Juan  
ne  
parle pas  
au téléphone
Juan NEG speaks NEG on the phone

(30) Catalan:  
Juan  
no  
parla pas  
per telèfon
Juan NEG speaks NEG on the phone

‘Juan does not talk on the phone’

As in examples (29) and (30), the first negator precedes the finite verb, whereas the second one follows it. It is important to mention that in spoken Catalan, pas is omitted so that the language forms part of Phase 1 (Juan no parla per telèfon ‘Juan does not speak on the phone). The reason for the apparently retrograde change of Catalan from Phase 2 to Phase 1 may be the geographical proximity with Spanish, which only has one preverbal negator no. In other words, it is possible that the negators in some varieties (see also spoken French and some varieties of Italian) can weaken and/or strengthen over a period of time due to close language contact between two dialects or languages. As a result, these varieties can correspond to two phases of Jespersen’s cycle.
Northern varieties of Italian, specifically western Piedmontese/Lombard, Valdôtain, Milanese, and Pavese, also form part of Phase 2 of Jespersen Cycle, where both preverbal and postverbal negators are used, i.e., NEG II (Zanuttini, 1997).

(31) Western Lombard: Kwela funna li no me pyas miga

that woman there NEG me pleases NEG

‘I do not like that woman’

However, the use of some postverbal negators (pa in Piedmontese, pa in Cognen, mia in Pavese and minga in Milanese) brings different interpretation and function to the negative sentence, specifically a presuppositional reading. Presupposition refers to the contexts in “which [the] non-negative counterpart of the proposition expressed by the sentence is assumed in the discourse”, i.e., entailed by the common ground (Zanuttini, 1997, p. 61). Other postverbal negators in these dialects have no discourse status and are used as ‘regular’ negators without any presupposition. Besides, they occupy a different position in comparison to presuppositional postverbal markers. For instance, when adverbs are present, presupposition markers always occupy a structurally higher position than those markers, which do not carry any interpretation (Zanuttini, 1997, p. 60). In this dissertation, I do not differentiate between implicit or assumed presupposition but rather treat presupposition as second negative mention (see pg. 76 for more discussion).

Finally, the dialects of Cembra and Lisagnago, spoken in the Trentino region, also form part of Phase 2, NEG II. These dialects contain two negators, one preverbally and another sentence finally, as in (32) and (33):

(32) Cembra: No kredo ke pödia parlar kon elo no

NEG believe that could talk with him NEG

‘I don’t think I could talk to him’

(33) Lisagnago: No gaj neanka pü en par de kalse no

NEG have ever no more a pair of socks NEG

‘I don’t even have a pair of socks anymore’

(Zanuttini, 1997, p. 97)
According to Zannuttini’s observations (1997), the final *no* in these dialects is used in restricted contexts only, specifically in focused constructions (pp. 96-97).

As for Phase 3, NEG III, in informal speech, speakers of standard French and Italian omit the preverbal negator and only use the postverbal one. In French, *ne* is omitted so that French is considered part of Phase 3. In a study on Quebec French, Sankoff & Vincent (1980) found that *ne* was deleted 99.5% of the time, in comparison to a previous study of 1967, where the deletion rate was only 38%. An unspecified spoken variety of Italian, which is not considered a standard variety, also omits the preverbal negative marker and uses a postverbal marker instead (Zanuttini, 1997). Furthermore, Bernini & Ramat (1996) show that for the past century there has been an increased reduction of NEG II to NEG III and the diffusion of NEG III in Italian colloquial popular varieties, specifically in the north (p.71).

(34) Spoken Italian: * Politicamente [non] erano niente*

    politically NEG they.were nothing

    ‘As for politics, there were not worth anything’

    (cited in Kim, 2000, p. 21)

Overall, this subsection discussed different positions and interpretations of negative elements in Romance languages, based on the three stages of Jespersen's negation cycle. The next subsections focus specifically on negation in the two varieties in contact in Chipilo: Veneto and Spanish. Even though Italian is not the focus of the present dissertation, it is important to describe negation in Italian, since it also exhibits ND within specific contexts. Aside from dialectal differences, Italian and Veneto share similar morphological and syntactic aspects. Additionally, given the fact that there is not much sociolinguistic research on the Veneto language in Italy, I present the data from Italian first to better understand negation.

---

10 Some of the participants spoke or learnt Italian. In this study, however, I did not separate the participants who spoke Italian from those who did not.
2.4.2.1 Negation in Italian

Negation in standard Italian usually occurs preverbally, before a finite verb, infinitive, or gerund, as shown above in (28). In addition to the preverbal negator non, negation in Italian can be expressed by employing another negative constituent, e.g., *nessuno* ‘nobody’ in (35) and *niente* ‘nothing’ in (36).

(35)  *Nessuno telefa* a Gianni  
      nobody  s/he.telephone  to Gianni  
      ‘Nobody calls Gianni’  
      (adopted from Haegeman, 1994, pp. 43-44)

(36)  *Gianni non legge niente*  
      Gianni NEG he.read  nothing  
      ‘Gianni does not read anything’  
      (adopted from Haegeman, 1994  pp. 43-44)

As seen in (35) and (36), other negators can occupy either a preverbal or postverbal position. If a negator is in the preverbal position, as in (35), *non* is omitted. Unlike (35), the negator *niente* in (36) is in the postverbal position; therefore, the preverbal *non* is mandatory.

The adverb *mica* can also be used postverbally, in tandem with a preverbal *non*, but only in pragmatically restricted contexts (Cinque, 1976; Zanuttini, 1997). According to Cinque (1976), *mica* “is restricted to those contexts in which the non-negative counterpart of the proposition expressed by the sentence is assumed in the discourse” (cited in Zanuttini, 1997, p. 61). In other words, *mica* is used to emphasize disagreement with the established common ground between the speaker and the listener. For example, in (37), a speaker knows that Gianni does not have a car and uses *mica* to emphasize the negation.

(37)  *Gianni non ha mica la macchina*  
      Gianni NEG has  NEG the  car
‘Gianni does not have a car’

(Schwenter, 2006, p. 8)

Schwenter (2006) furthermore claims that in a popular spoken variety of Northern Italian, *mica* is the only negator used in this context; the preverbal *non* is omitted (p. 8). According to Cerruti (*in prep.*), however, the use of *mica* only in the postverbal position is widespread “among uneducated elderly speakers” and represents a sub-standard use (p.6). Additionally, Cerruti (*in prep.*) affirms that starting from the 20th century, *mica* is used preverbally, in place of *non* as in *mica V*, which represents a standard use. The difference between the two forms depend on discourse/propositional contexts.\(^{11}\)

To sum up, negation in standard Italian is preverbal. When other negators are used, *non* is only mandatory when the other negators are postverbal, for example, in object position. In some restricted contexts, a negative adverb, *mica*, can also be used. The following subsection describes negation in Veneto in Italy.

### 2.4.2.2 Negation in Veneto, Trentino Region

To my knowledge, there has not been a study analyzing the distribution of ND and factors favouring contexts with ND in Veneto. Cecilia Poletto (personal communication, January 30, 2016), who specializes in syntactic analysis of negation in Veneto, notes that the variety has not changed a lot, with regard to negation patterns. She identifies three *negators* (*miga*, *gninte*, and *no*), which all occur postverbally but serve different functions in a sentence. *Miga*, similar to *mica* in standard Italian, is strictly a presuppositional marker, whereas *no* has a semantic implicature favoured in contexts with reinforcement and question-answer pairs. In Poletto’s work (2008), the final negator *no* in Veneto is a focus negator, which emphasizes or reinforces the negation, as in (37). It is important to keep in mind that the final *no*, as mentioned in Chapter

\(^{11}\) See Cerruti (*in prep.*) for more detailed discussion of *mica*’s use. https://www.academia.edu/34458336/.
1, is not the main licensing negator; final no is not interpreted as an additional negator but rather functions as negative concord licensed by a preverbal negator, which is interpreted.

(38) Veneto: No ghe vado NO!

\[
\text{NEG there I go NEG}
\]

‘I will not go there!’.

(Poletto, 2008, p. 181)

Examples like (38) refer to evidential contexts where both the speaker and the hearer share common ground about the negated event; in other words, both interlocutor and hearer know about the place where the interlocutor does not want to go. This is consistent with Poletto (personal communication, Jan 30, 2016), who claims that the use of the final no is favoured with a previously negated context, which should be self-evident to speaker and interlocutor. With regard to previous adjacent elements, Poletto claims that the final no is adjacent to and favoured in contexts with the verb as a previous constituent, i.e., preceding the final no. This is similar to the example in (38), where vado ‘I go’ occurs before the final no.

With regard to social factors, Poletto (personal communication, January 30, 2016) states that ND occurs frequently among all social groups, because the Veneto language is not considered a low variety; rather, it holds a prestigious status in the community. Furthermore, she claims that occasionally Veneto speakers transfer the final no when speaking standard Italian. However, in contrast to Poletto’s observations, other previous studies (Ghimenton, 2013, 2015; MacKay, 2002; Zago Bronca, personal communication, May 20, 2011) found that Veneto in Italy is not a prestigious variety, and that is why many Veneto speakers prefer to speak standard Italian. Specifically, Ghimenton (2015) reports a 2006 survey on language usage and states that Veneto’s usage is decreasing among younger generations, who “prefer Italian as the language medium for their daily communication” (p.121).

2.4.2.3 Negation in Spanish
This subsection describes negation in standard Spanish, which is essential for comparison and contrast with Veneto. In standard Spanish, negation is preverbal, as in (39):

(39)  \textit{Rodrigo no canta bien.} \\
Rodrigo NEG sings well \\
‘Rodrigo does not sing well’

In sentences with other negative words, two positions of negators are possible. A negative word can either follow a verb (40) or precede it (41).

(40)  \textit{No dijo la verdad nadie} \\
NEG said the truth nobody \\
‘Nobody told the truth’

(41)  \textit{Nadie dijo la verdad} \\
nobody said the truth \\
‘Nobody told the truth’

The English translations of (40) and (41) are identical. In Spanish, similar to standard Italian, the position and interpretation are different. First, in (40), \textit{nadie} ‘nobody’ occurs after the verbal phrase, whereas in (41), it is in the subject position, preceding the verb. Besides, as we recall from §2.3.1, in order for (40) to be a grammatical sentence with \textit{nadie} ‘nobody’ in postverbal position, the presence of preverbal \textit{no}, a negative operator, is necessary. In contrast to (40), \textit{nadie} ‘nobody’ in (41) does not require another negator to be grammatical, as it appears preverbally. Moreover, it would be ungrammatical to include \textit{no} in the preverbal position with another negator in the subject position.\textsuperscript{12} Second, the position of the negators in the sentence can be different according to the focus of the sentence. For example, sentences similar to (40) are usually broad focused, whereas sentences which start with negative words can have narrow focus on the negative constituent, and are restricted to certain contexts, as in (42).

\textsuperscript{12} In the Argentinian variety of Corrientes however, the inclusion of both negators is possible (see §2.4.3.3 below).
¿Cuál de las dos pinturas te gusta?

‘Which of the two paintings do you like?’

Ninguna me gusta

none I like

‘I do not like any’

Based on example (42), the interlocutor wants to emphasize ninguna ‘none’ by putting focus on the negative word, and therefore places ninguna in preverbal position. In contrast to (41), having the object nada ‘nothing’ in postverbal position allows for a wider focus reading; therefore, it is more common to say nada ‘nothing’ in the original postverbal position:

No quiero nada

no I want nothing

‘I do not want anything’

To sum up, in Italian and Spanish the main negator is preverbal. However, in Italian, similar to Veneto, there exists a second negative marker, which is used in restricted contexts. To deepen the knowledge and understanding of negation in the variationist context, the next subsection discusses other cases of ND in Romance languages.

2.4.3 Other cases of ND in Romance varieties

This subsection focuses on three other varieties — Brazilian Portuguese, the Spanish of Argentinian Corrientes, and Minorcan Spanish — that also exhibit ND. Two varieties, the Spanish of Argentinian Corrientes and Minorcan Spanish are in contact with other languages, such as Guaraní and Catalan, respectively. Brazilian Portuguese, unlike the above two varieties, historically has been in contact with many languages including Afrikaans, and today also
exhibits ND. Therefore, it is crucial to report data on these three varieties, relevant as they are to the present work, so as to investigate the frequency and the contexts of ND usage in these varieties and compare them with the case of Chipileño Spanish.

2.4.3.1 Negation in Brazilian Portuguese

Brazilian Portuguese exhibits three ways to express sentential negation (Bernini and Ramat, 1996; Biberauer and Cyrino, 2009b; Martínez, 2006; Schwenter, 2005, 2006; Teixeira de Sousa, 2011, 2012).

(44)  NEG  VP  
      Eu não saí.  
      I NEG left.  
      ‘I didn’t leave.’

(45)  NEG  VP  NEG  
      Agora não entra mais não.  
      now NEG enter more NEG  
      ‘Nobody else enters anymore.’

(46)  VP  NEG  
      Tenho não.  
      I. have NEG  
      ‘I don’t have.’

From Sousa’s analyzed corpus (Table 2.1), Sousa (2007) concludes that preverbal negation, as in (44), is the most frequent type (84%), whereas the other two cases of negation are not that common.

Table 2.1. Frequencies of types of sentential negation in Brazilian Portuguese (cf. Sousa, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of negation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative doubling [não VP não]</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard negation [não VP]</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG 3 [V não]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only preverbal negation as in (43) can occur in all contexts and is considered the canonical negation, whereas the other two forms are related to a specific information structure or context. Figure 2.3 shows an example of ND with a final falling contour.

Figure 2.3 shows an example of ND with a final falling contour.

Figure 2.3. Pitch Track Nã o vai sair com meu carro nã o ‘You will not go out with my car NEG’ (Teixeira de Sousa, 2013, p. 12)

As seen in Figure 2.3, the final no has a falling intonation. However, originally in the colonial Portuguese, sentences with final no had “the intonation break between the sentence and the negative morpheme” (Schwenter, 2006, p. 10) and represented a discourse tag element, i.e., an adjunct located on the right periphery of the main clause (Biberauer & Cyrino, 2009b, p. 2). In other words, there were two separate sentences: one with the preverbal não and the other one consisting of solely não, similar to a tag question. In 16th century, elements were combined and formed one sentence with a falling intonation (cited in Kim, 2010, p. 73-74). Today both kinds of no are present in Brazilian Portuguese but must be treated differently, as one of them is used only as a tag question with a final rising contour and the other is an instance of true ND (Martínez, 2006; Schwenter, 2005, 2006).

According to Teixeira de Sousa (2012), cases with two negators or ND, as in (45), emphasize the sentential negation, where final no serves as a marker of polarity focus; by contrast, cases like (46) are used to deny or correct given information (Teixeira de Sousa, 2013, p. 2). Schwenter (2005) also studied negation in Brazilian Portuguese and concluded that sentences
with ND were restricted to occurrences with ‘common ground’ and propositional denials to ensure the interlocutor interpreted the sentence. Furthermore, the use of the sentence-final negator não “is restricted to denials of activated, salient discourse-old propositions” (Schwenter, 2006, p. 13).

(47)  
A. Você viu esse programa?

you watched that program?

‘Did you watch that program?’

B. Não vi não

NEG I.saw NEG

‘I did not watch it’.

In example (47) the first interlocutor ‘activates’ or introduces the topic that becomes interpreted as a hearer-old context, therefore licensing the second final negator. (Schwenter, 2006, pp. 14-15). Based on Schwenter’s (2005) claim, the second final não has similar pragmatic usage as mica in Standard Italian. In my dissertation, I adopt a slightly different approach, which investigates whether final no is used as a reinforcement marker and not as a denial of proposition. My previous study did however show that ND was used in contexts which were ‘activated’ or introduced by the previously immediate negated clause.

2.4.3.2 Spanish in contact with Minorcan Catalan

Another case of ND with final focused negation, as in (48), is found in Spanish in contact with Minorcan Catalan (De Prada Pérez, 2008).

(48) No me dijónada no

NEG me told nothing NEG

‘She did not tell me anything’
In (48), the final no is clause-internal (with L%); in other words, it is not preceded by a pause and therefore differs from Spanish tag questions (with H%), where the final no is separated by a pause from a previous constituent. In an experimental study of controlled laboratory speech, De Prada Pérez (2008) measured F0 height of the final no to investigate whether the final no is clause internal (ND) with L% or clause external (tag questions) with H%. Given that this construction is attested only in Minorcan Catalan and not present in standard Spanish, she proposed that L1, Catalan, had an effect on speakers’ production. Her results showed that focused negation only occurred in the speech of L1 Catalan bilingual speakers, which supported the transfer effect from their L1.

2.4.3.3 Negation in Argentinian Spanish – the case of Corrientes

The Argentinian variety of Corrientes Spanish (CS) exhibits cases of ND possibly due to contact with Guaraní, an indigenous language where ND exists. In their study, Cuervo and Mazzaro (2013) analyzed the alternative ways of using negation with the presence of negative words. Consider the following examples:

(49) Nadie abrió la puerta
Nobody opened the door

(50) Nadie no abrió la puerta
Nobody [NEG] opened the door

‘Nobody opened the door’

In most dialects of Spanish, the example in (49) is the only possible variant to express the above negative sentence Nadie abrió la puerta ‘Nobody opened the door’, where negative word nadie ‘nobody’ occurs in the preverbal position, preceding the verb. Example (50) is ungrammatical in most varieties, based on the interaction between the presence of a preverbal negative word

---

13 In the given example, is also possible to place nadie ‘nobody’ in the postverbal position: No abrió la puerta nadie ‘Nobody opened the door’. Given that doubling in Corrientes Spanish consists of two negative elements in preverbal position, the variant with postverbal nadie is not discussed.
and the presence of negator no in the Spanish negative concord system, illustrated in (40) and (41) above. Sentence (50) can only be grammatical in most varieties as a marked case with a double negation reading. However, in the Spanish of Corrientes both examples are grammatical. Cuervo & Mazzaro (2013) found that three linguistic variables (specificity value of a negative word, distance in number of words between the negative word and preverbal no, and type of the negative word) favoured the use of ND. Social factors (age and sex) however, had no effect on elicitation of ND. This suggests that the variation in Corrientes is stable and occurs with all social groups.

To sum up, this subsection discussed three cases of languages or dialects which exhibit ND. These cases are crucial for the discussion of the current dissertation because two of these varieties, the Spanish of Corrientes and Minorcan Spanish, have been in contact with other languages, similar to the situation in Chipilo. Also, declarative sentences with ND in Brazilian Portuguese and Minorcan Spanish have a falling contour on the final no, similar to Chipileño Spanish. Chapter 5 compares and discusses ND in Chipilo and the above three varieties.

2.5 Linguistic variables to be investigated in the present study

As seen in earlier sections, there has not been extensive variationist study on negation in Chipileño Spanish or other Romance varieties. The previous sections, however, showed that ND is an infrequent phenomenon in Chipileño Spanish, as well as in the other previously mentioned varieties (see section 2.4). This project examines several linguistic variables that may have a significant effect on ND use. These variables, or factors expected to influence the use of ND, include negative mention in a preceding context, type of verb, other negative words, and different adjacent constituents in conjunction with final ‘no’.

In this project the term ‘negative mention in a preceding context’ refers to the occurrence of two negative clauses forming part of one negative idea, with the second clause being where the ND potentially occurs. More specifically, the first negative mention ‘sets the ground’ or ‘activates’ the negative context, whereas the second negative mention refers to the already established common ground or idea of that previous sentential negation. In a negative scenario, the first
negative mention, formed with SN, occurs first, followed by the second negative mention, which occurs immediately after the negated clause with SN, i.e., the first negative mention, within the same negative context. From the earlier example (50), the participant recalls the story of being treated badly by a monolingual speaker, because she is not the same as a monolingual Mexican.

(51) [Nos tratan así] Por los que se sienten españoles o algo así, y no tienen ni maíz (first negative mention).

Pero no te lo aceptan no (second negative mention), yo soy español o francés... y son López y Pérez. Y esos apellidos están hasta debajo de las piedras.

‘[They treat us like that] By those who feel they are Spanish or something like that, they do not even have corn’. But they do not accept it NEG, I am Spanish or French, and they are Lopez or Perez. And these last names are all over the place’

In this example, the first mention occurs in the first sentence, in which the participant introduces or ‘activates’ the negative context. Then, the second negative mention occurs in the second sentence, as an intensifier of the negated idea that was presented in the first sentence. In other words, the final no is interpreted as an intensifier of the first negative mention within the scope of the same negative context. Other specific examples are shown in the following chapter for the Forced Choice Preference (see pg. 93) and Sentence Completion Tasks (see pg. 95).

The second linguistic variable investigated in two of the tasks (Interviews and Forced Choice Preference Task) is the identity of the verb in negative sentences. In the Interviews, identity of verb is determined in relation to the immediately previous verb used, either in the same sentence or the previous one. Recalling example (22), the speaker uses two distinct verbs: No tienes ganas de... ‘no desire to...’ and no pasamos no ‘do not fit NEG’, so, for this token, the verb identity would be coded as ‘different.’ In the Forced Choice Preference Task, type of verb refers only to the verb in the answer set. In other words, if coded ‘same’, it means that the verb in the responses is the same as in the given question (51). If coded as ‘different’, the two verbs in the question-answer pair are different (52):

(52) same verb: Regresa Jorge al hotel?

come back Jorge to the hotel
‘Does Jorge come back to the hotel?’

a) Tampoco  regresa
neither  he. comes back

b) Regresa   tampoco
he. comes back  neither

c) Tampoco  regresa  no
neither  he. comes back  NEG

‘No he does not come either’.

(53) different verb:
¿Por qué le  pasó  eso?
why  her  happened  that

‘Why did it happen to her?’

a) Porque  no  estudió  no.
because  NEG  studied  NEG
b) Porque  no  ha estudiado.14
because  NEG  she. has studied
c) Porque  no  estudió
because  NEG  studied

‘Because she did not study.’

Example (52) is different from (53) in the type of the verb used: in the first set the answers have the same verb as in the question, while the second set has different verbs in the question and the answers.

14 In some varieties of Spanish, specifically in Castilian Spanish, speakers extensively use the present perfect tense. In the Mexican variety, however, the present perfect is not common. Instead, the past simple preterit is used. The response (3b) to the example (3) Porque no ha estudiando ‘Because she has not studied’ is illogical because the question was formed using the past simple tense ‘pasó’ ‘happened-PST/happened’, therefore, the option (3c) is expected. In Veneto, however, one of the past tenses (passato prossimo) is formed with an auxiliary verb (avere or essere) and a past participle. Therefore, if bilingual speakers picked the option (3b), it was possibly due to a transfer effect from Veneto into Spanish. While this morphosyntactic distinction is not the focus of my dissertation, this proposition merits further research.
Since De Prada Pérez (2008) and Cuervo & Mazzaro (2013) showed examples of ND with other negators, this present dissertation investigates, as its third linguistic independent variable, the possibility of effects on ND from other negative words. Recalling ND in Corrientes Spanish consists on the co-occurrence of no with other negative words in a preverbal position, and is favoured specifically with tampoco ‘neither’ and nada ‘nothing’ (see pg.75). Even though the phenomenon of ND in Corrientes Spanish is different from ND in Chipileño Spanish, it is important to include negative words and their position as an independent linguistic variable to determine whether ND in Chipileño Spanish is circumscribed to the negator no, or if it is a phenomenon that generalizes over or is affected by various vocabulary items.

More specifically, I examine nadie ‘nobody’, ningún ‘no one’, tampoco ‘neither’, and their position within the sentence (preverbal and postverbal), as in (54) and (545):

(54) Preverbal Position:  Ningún chico come doce tortillas no

no boy eats twelve tortillas NEG

‘No boy eats twelve tortillas’

(55) Postverbal Position:  No se mezcla nadie no

no mixes up nobody NEG

‘Nobody mixes up’

Given that the preliminary results found very few ND tokens to analyze with a verb as the immediate preceding element, I also included other constituents (e.g., adverb, noun, adjective, pronoun) as an independent variable to see whether final no is favoured with other possible adjacent constituents. Barnes (2009) found a few examples of ND with other constituents during her informal conversations with bilingual participants in Chipileño Spanish. The examples of ND with other constituents are seen in (56-60):

(56) Verb:  Juan no trabaja no

Juan NEG work NEG

‘Juan does not work’

(57) Noun:  Nosotros no hablamos italiano no
we   NEG    speak    Italian    NEG
‘We do not speak Italian’

(58) Adverb:    No     nos levantamos    tarde     no
NEG    we get up   late   NEG
‘We do not get up late’

(59) Negative Determiner Phrase:    No     habla    italiano    ninguna mujer    no
NEG    speaks    Italian    no    woman    NEG
‘No woman speaks Italian NEG’

(60) Negative Pronoun:    No      se mezcla    nadie     no
‘NEG one mixes up    nobody    NEG’

2.6 Questions and Hypotheses

The three questions that guide this dissertation, as well as three corresponding main hypotheses, are presented below. The main hypotheses are based on previous data and results from literature (e.g., Barnes, 2009; MacKay, 2002; Tararova, 2014).

1) What is the distribution of the final no (62) in Spanish in Chipilo, in comparison with the default option of one single preverbal no (61)? Is the distribution of ND different in each task?

(61)    El     no     va,    ¿no?
He    NEG    goes    NEG
‘He does not go, right?’

(62)    El     no     va     no
He    NEG    goes    NEG
‘He does not go’
2) Do any linguistic factors have a significant effect on the distribution of ND in Chipileño Spanish? The linguistic factors considered are:

a) previous adjacent element (noun, verb, adverb, negative pronoun and/or negative determiner phrase),

b) use of other negative words (their position (preverbal or postverbal) and type (*neither, nobody, no one*)) and the final *no*,

c) type of verb, and

d) negative mention in a preceding context.

3) How do social factors (sex, age, and parents’ ethnicity) affect ND in Chipilo? Based on previous literature, three hypotheses corresponding to the above three research questions are put forward.

Hypothesis I: Task effects

Given that SN is a standard variant in Spanish, I expect to see a higher percentage of its use in comparison to the ND variant. This was confirmed in my previous work (Tararova, 2014), where I found that the use of ND was infrequent in the speech of Chipileño bilinguals. However, since a number of linguists (e.g., Milroy, 1987; Milroy & Gordon, 2003) showed that it is usually hard to obtain a sufficient number of tokens when studying a morphosyntactic variable in spontaneous speech, it is probable that more controlled tasks (e.g., Sentence Repetition Task, Forced Choice Preference Task, Sentence Completion Task) will elicit a higher percentage of ND contexts. In other words, I expect to find a relevant task effect when eliciting the phenomenon. Specifically, I expect to find a higher rate of ND in the Sentence Repetition task and a lower rate in the spontaneous speech.

Hypothesis II: Linguistic factor effects

Based on discussion of three other Romance varieties (Cuervo & Mazzaro, 2013; De Prada Pérez, 2008; Schwenter, 2005), as well as the findings reported in my previous work (Tararova, 2014), the presence of ND will be favoured in the following contexts:
a) the verb as a previous adjacent constituent (NEG-Verb-NEG);
b) second negative mention;
c) a different verb from the preceding context;
d) the absence of other negative words.

Hypothesis III: Social factor effects
Based on the studies in section §2.4.3, including my preliminary work (Tararova, 2014) and a brief mention in Barnes (2009), none of the studies showed significant results of any social factors on ND production and use. However, according to my observations while in Chipilo, I predict the following effects for social factors:

a) ND will occur among bilingual (Veneto and Spanish) Chipileños only. Both Barnes (2009) and my preliminary work (Tararova, 2014) observed presence of final no among bilingual speakers only. These results are also similar to the case of the Minorcan Spanish variety. Only bilingual speakers of Spanish and Catalan used ND, as opposed to monolingual Spanish speakers (De Prada Pérez, 2008).

b) Given that most Chipileño females work as housewives and take care of their children, a higher rate of ND is expected to occur among bilingual Chipileños and participants whose mothers are Chipileños, whereas monolingual Mexicans and those participants whose father is Chipileño will produce more cases of the standard variant.

c) Since Veneto holds a prestigious status in the community, women are expected to produce a higher number of contexts with ND than men (cf. Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003; Labov, 1991/2001), as well as my preliminary pilot study (Tararova, 2014), which found a higher rate of ND among females.

d) According to previous studies (Eckert, 1998; Labov, 2001), older speakers usually belong to a locally based social network with a higher exposure to the local variety and use vernacular forms more often. Therefore, for the current dissertation, the older group is predicted to show a higher rate of ND in comparison to the younger age group. The younger group will opt for SN more frequently, because the majority of them work or study in Puebla, a Mexican region where Veneto is no longer used (Tararova, 2012, 2014). The majority of older speakers are retired and usually stay in the community (Tararova (2012), so their use of Veneto is usually more frequent in comparison to the younger group. Additionally, my pilot study (Tararova, 2014) found that older speakers opted for the option with ND more than the younger group.
Since this is the first in-depth study to examine ND from a sociolinguistic perspective, the nature of this dissertation is exploratory. However, considering the above questions and findings, I will identify relevant factors that contribute to transfer of this morphological phenomenon in a bilingual setting.

2.7 Summary of the chapter

This chapter provided an overview of three main theories on language transfer and change (King, 2000/2012; Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). Two of the proposals regarding external factors argue that demographic factors (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988) and transfer, specifically between typologically similar languages (Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988), are the primary determinants of language change. In contrast, one proposal focuses on language-internal factors. This proposal of syntactic borrowing suggests that transfer happens by means of lexical item insertion in the recipient language (King, 2000). I then described various causes, outcomes, and types of transfer, based on Thomason and Kauffman’s (1988) borrowing scale. The discussion then focused on describing different types of transfer in Chipileño Spanish and showing how they fit with certain aspects of the borrowing scale. Finally, the chapter described the syntax of Romance negation, specifically different stages of position and use of negative markers. The chapter ended with a discussion of ND in other Romance varieties and languages in contact. Based on this background, I proposed three hypotheses relating to three research questions, one regarding task effects, one regarding linguistic (internal) factors and one regarding social (external) factors.

The previous studies that I have discussed allow me to investigate the phenomenon in greater depth and suggest rationales for the distributions I find. I discuss the relevance of the above proposals to the current project in Chapter 5 as I interpret the results from Chapter 4. This dissertation, therefore, contributes to the field of language transfer and bilingualism by specifically showing the interplay between structural and non-structural factors that promote or impede contact induced changes in a given community.
Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1 Introduction

Building on findings from previous analyses of negative doubling (e.g., Barnes, 2009, Cuervo and Mazzaro, 2013; Schwenter 2005, 2006; Sousa, 2007; Tararova, 2014; Texeira de Sousa, 2011), this project investigates negative doubling in Chipileño Spanish, by examining possible effects of internal and external factors on the alternation between ND and other forms of negation. This dissertation specifically investigates whether social or linguistic factor(s) condition the transfer of the phenomenon. Given that morphosyntactic phenomena can be more problematic to find than phonetic phenomena in terms of sufficient data (Lavandera, 1974; Milroy, 1987; Milroy & Gordon, 2003), both experimental and sociolinguistic interview methods were used to elicit negative forms in the speech of the bilingual and monolingual speakers of Chipilo. These methods focused on finding the frequency and distribution of variation in ND use, by identifying factors that contribute to its variation. The materials were selected to test whether ND was selected at a higher frequency in specific linguistic environments. Data were collected during a one-month stay in Chipilo in August of 2014; all the tasks were administrated by the researcher.\(^\text{15}\)

This chapter is organized as follows. Section 3.2 discusses participant criteria. Section 3.3 describes the methods and materials, which include a sociolinguistic questionnaire (3.3.1), a guided conversation (3.3.2), a forced choice preference task (3.3.3), a sentence completion task (3.3.4), and a sentence repetition task (3.3.5). The next two sections describe procedures for obtaining the data (3.4) and data analysis (3.5), the latter of which is divided into four subsections: transcriptions and coding (3.5.1), qualitative analysis (3.5.2), quantitative analysis (3.5.3) and exclusions (3.5.4). The chapter ends with a short summary of the above sections (3.6).

\(^{15}\) Since this was my second fieldwork trip, I knew a few participants, who had previously participated in another project for my MA thesis.
3.2 Participants

A total of 113 participants were recruited for this project. The participants were divided into four groups, according to their level of bilingualism and the ethnicity of their parents. Previous work (Tararova, 2012) only analyzed bilingual speakers and monolingual Spanish speakers; therefore, in this project, I also include mixed groups. The first group, Chipileños–CH– (n=40) included participants who were bilingual in Veneto (L1) and Spanish (L2) and used both languages on a daily basis, with both parents ethnically Chipileños. I adopt the same definition of a ‘Chipileño’ as used in Tararova (2012), which includes both the residents of Chipilo as well as the Italian descendants (p. 5). The Veneto-based language used by them is also referred to as ‘Chipileño.’ The second group – CHM – (n=20) consisted of participants who were bilingual in Veneto and Spanish, and whose mothers were Chipileño (Veneto as L1) but whose fathers were monolingual (Mexican) Spanish speakers. The third group – CHP – (n=19) also included participants who were bilingual in Veneto and Spanish, but whose mothers were monolingual Spanish speakers and whose fathers were Chipileño (Veneto as L1). The separation of the second group and third group allows us to examine the possible difference in effect of the L1 of the two parents, testing the hypothesis that the language of the mother influences the language of a child due to a closer interaction (Silva-Corvalán, 2001). Lastly, the participants in the fourth group, M, (n=34) were monolingual Mexican Spanish-speakers whose parents were both monolingual in Spanish. The difference in number among the groups is due to availability; there were fewer participants descended from mixed marriages in the community.

The criteria for Chipileños to participate in the study were that they be eighteen years old or older and reside in Chipilo. The criteria for monolingual Mexicans were slightly different. They had to be monolingual Spanish speakers, the age of eighteen or older, and have close connections with Chipilo, either through work or personal contacts.17

---

16 The total number of recorded participants was 121. Two participants overheard other participants completing the tasks and were excluded from the experiment. Three more participants were excluded due to abnormal hearing (they either did not complete all the tasks or were using the help of their relatives to interpret and complete the tasks). Five other participants got busy half way through the experiment so they could not complete all the tasks.

17 Monolingual means, here, non-Veneto speaking. Most participants reported that they studied English in school. However, they rated their English as elementary and were not able to carry on a basic conversation. One of the participants (MH21) reported Nahuatl as his L1, yet he does not use it on a regular basis and claimed that he had forgotten most of it. Two of the participants (MHV1 and MHV2) spoke Italian as their L2. Given that they did not
Twenty one Mexican participants had been living in Chipilo for a long time: ten participants had resided in the community for over thirty years, five participants for over twenty, six participants for over ten; nine participants for less than ten years. Only five participants had lived or worked in Chipilo between one and six months. These last five participants were included for this project because they had established very close connections with Chipileños by working inside the community in local shops.

For the analysis, all participants were given a code in an Excel spreadsheet in order to ensure confidentiality. The participants were divided into groups by parents’ ethnicity, gender, and age. There were two major ethnicity groups, Chipileños (CH, n=79) and monolingual Mexicans (M, n=34). Chipileños were divided into three subgroups depending on their parents’ ethnicity, as described above. Each group included two genders: males (M, n=56), and females (F, n=57). Participants were also divided into two age groups: younger group, 18-34 (n=49) and older group, 35-70 (n=64). The distribution is illustrated in Table 3.1, which summarizes the participants’ profiles.

Table 3.1. Speaker sample categorized by sex, age and parents’ ethnicity (N = 113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH Both parents Chipileños</th>
<th>CHM Mother is Chipileño, father is monolingual Mexican</th>
<th>CHP Father is Chipileño, mother is monolingual Mexican</th>
<th>M Both parents monolingual Mexicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger group (18-34)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older group (35-70)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

use Italian on a regular basis and did not speak Veneto, I included them in the study. Also, another participant classified as monolingual (MFJ6) claimed she only learned Veneto after her marriage with a Chipileño. Prior to interviewing her, she did not use Veneto or transfer any words from Veneto into Spanish, and therefore was included in the study.
3.3 Tasks and Materials

All data were gathered by the researcher using both conversational elicitations and three experimental methods: a Sentence Completion Task, a Sentence Repetition Task, and a Forced Choice Preference Task. All four tasks sought to elicit the occurrence of ND in the speech of Chipileños. Prior to recording the participants, a consent form together with a background questionnaire (adapted from Colantoni & Steele, 2007) was distributed to all of the participants.

3.3.1 Background Questionnaire

The questionnaire was written in Spanish and I expected that the participant had adequate literacy for both reading and comprehension. When participants did not understand a question, I paraphrased it orally. The majority of the questionnaires were filled out by the participants; for the older generations, I sometimes read the questions and wrote down their answers. The format of the questionnaire was as follows. The first set of questions asked for personal information (sex, year of birth, birthplace, profession, and level of education). The second set concentrated on L1 (first language of the participants and their parents, comfort level in speaking their L1, and language(s) spoken at home during childhood). The third set of questions was about the use of each language (percentage spoken in schools, at home, at work, and with friends). The fourth set was dedicated to other languages (year of acquisition, place of acquisition, and number of hours per day speaking that language). The last set was the participant’s evaluation of their own linguistic competence. The purpose of the questionnaires was to divide participants into groups more accurately according to the social factors (age and language competence of both participants and their parents) in order to see what effects these factors may have on the choice of negation strategies. In total, there were five sets of questions, and the entire questionnaire took about ten minutes to complete. All questions were open-ended, excepting a few (education level, sex, age group) in which participants had to choose one of the options. Participants were
divided into their corresponding groups according to their responses to questions from sections A and B. Refer to Appendix A to see the questionnaire.

All oral tasks were recorded using a Marantz PMD-60 recorder and Audio Technica 831-CW Lavalier microphone. All files were transferred and saved in .wav format.

3.3.2 Elicited speech conversation/ Interview

The first recorded task was a short interview or elicited speech conversation, which sought to elicit spontaneous use of ND. In this Task, I included a total of twenty questions – open-ended and closed-ended questions – as aids for getting to know the participants better and potentially eliciting cases of negation. The first set of questions was general in topic, in order to “break the ice” and create a less formal, more relaxed environment between the interviewer and the interviewee(s). These questions were treated more like distractors since participants talked about their family and relatives.

Q1. Were you born in Italy?
Q2: How about your grandparents?

Another set of questions was specific to the distinct characteristics of Chipileño speech.

Q3: Could you think of some characteristics of Chipileño speech? / What do they use differently from monolingual Mexican people?

During my previous research, Q3 elicited mention of ND. The next set of questions concerned participants’ attitudes about the Chipileño language.

Q5: How do you perceive their [Chipileño] speech when you hear the incorporation of features from Veneto into Spanish?
Q6: Do you think all Chipileños speak the same/use the same features? Why not?

---

18 Note, elicited conversational speech will be referred to as “interview” in this dissertation
19See Gibbons & Ramírez (2004) for more details.
Q7: Does incorporation of Veneto features into Spanish make a Chipileño very/somewhat/not different from a monolingual Spanish/Mexican speaker?

Questions (5-7) determined the attitudes of bilingual and monolingual groups towards Veneto, specifically whether the language was considered stigmatized or not. Previous research (Tararova, 2012) found positive attitudes of all Chipileño speakers towards their language. Monolingual Mexicans, however, showed a lower percentage of positive answers, primarily because they argued about the unimportance of Veneto globally. Also, they noted that racism in Chipilo was present because of the use of Veneto that divided Chipilo into two groups: those who speak the language and those who do not.

All of the interviews were obtained individually with the researcher either in the historical archives centre, or at participants’ houses in order to create a less formal setting and maximize the use of the variant. The conversations lasted between 15 and 20 minutes; the first 5-7 minutes were dedicated to general topics of the community that led to more directed topics regarding the ND variable. Given that the first task was semi-spontaneous, the data obtained was used to test all of the hypotheses.

3.3.3 Forced Choice Preference Task

The second task was the Forced Choice Preference Task. Stimuli were recorded by a local Chipileño speaker in Spanish. Given that I am not a local Veneto speaker, a Chipileño speaker was chosen to produce the utterances with questions and answers due to her local speech accent, as well as her native ability to produce ND contours. The experiment started with a practice scenario to familiarize participants with the nature of the task, followed by nine short target scenarios with two questions and three possible answers. After listening to the story, participants had to select the option most appropriate to the context and then produce it. The answers included one default option with one negator or NEG-word (SN), an ungrammatical option, and the marked option with ND. The selection part of the task determined whether ND was the

---

20 Refer to Appendix C.
preferred option and the production part allowed me to hear whether the final ‘no’ had a falling contour, a characteristic of ND, or a rising contour, a characteristic of a tag question. One of the examples is shown below.

(1)  Rosario organizó una fiesta en su casa, pero nadie vino, ni siquiera su mejor amiga, Ana.

‘Rosario organized a party at her house but nobody came, not even her best friend, Ana.’

Question 1: ¿Vino la mejor amiga de Rosario, Ana?

came the best friend of Rosario, Ana

‘Did Rosario’s best friend, Ana, come?’

Answer 1: No, tampoco vino.

no, neither came

‘No, she did not come either’

Answer 2: No, no vino tampoco no

no, NEG came neither NEG

‘No, she did not come either’

Answer 3: No, no vino no

no, nobody came NEG

‘No, she did not come’

As seen in answers (1-3), the first option is the SN variant, the second answer is ungrammatical, and the third option uses ND. The target scenarios included semantically different answers (i.e. the option with SN and ND) and different negative words (tampoco ‘neither’, nadie ‘nobody’).

The benefit of providing answers to the participants was to reduce the number of options and avoid discrepancies in their answers.

This task tested three linguistic factors, use of the same or different verb in question-pair responses, negative mention (first or second), and use and type of another negative word. Each set of answers included a standard variant (SN); an option with ND; and an ungrammatical option. (4) exemplifies the second of these independent variables, which was the negative mention in the preceding context. Negative mention had a slightly different interpretation from
the one mentioned earlier (p.75). It was determined based on two question-answer pairs, with the first mention in the first question-answer pair and the second negation mention in the second question-answer pair. In other words, negative mention was based on a sequence of question-answer pairs. Specifically, the second negative mention occurred after the ‘activation’ of the first question-answer pair only if the first question-answer pair was negative, as in (2). The second negative mention was used in the second question-answer pair since the context of that previous negative question-answer pair was established.

(2)  
Ana cumplió años el lunes pero decidió hacer su fiesta el sábado anterior porque nadie podía venir el lunes.

‘Ana had her birthday on Monday but she decided to have her party on Saturday because nobody could make it on Monday’.

First negative mention:

¿Hizo Ana su fiesta de cumpleaños el lunes?

did Ana her party of birthday on Monday

‘Did Ana have her birthday on Monday?’

a) No, no la hizo el lunes.

no, NEG it did the Monday

b) No, no la hizo no.

no, NEG it did NEG

c) No, no la hacía el lunes no.

no, NEG it did the Monday NEG

‘No, she did not (NEG)’

Second negative mention:

¿Podía venir alguien a la fiesta de Ana el lunes?

could come anyone to the party of Ana on Monday’
‘Could somebody come to Ana’s birthday on Monday?’

a) No, nadie podía

no, nobody could/ no could nobody

b) No, no podía nadie no.

no, NEG could nobody NEG

c) No, nadie no pudo no.

no, nobody NEG could NEG

‘No, nobody could NEG’

The first question-answer pair refers to the first negative mention, which sets the ground of the context of ‘impossibility of doing a birthday on a weekday’. The second question-answer pair is the second negative mention, which occurs after the first question-answer pair. In other words, the first question-answer pair sets the ground of or activates the negated context, while the second set reinforces the idea of already established negative common ground and the denial of the context.

If the context in the two question-answer pairs included extra information, which was not used in the given context, the second question-answer pair was not second negative mention, but rather was a new case of first negative mention, as in (3):

(3) Mañana es el día del examen, pero Susana salió a pasear con sus amigas.

‘Tomorrow it is the exam day, but Susana went out with her friends’.

First negative mention:

¿Qué pasó al final?

what happened at the end

‘What happened at the end?’

a) Susana no pasó el examen.

---

21 Participants could also say their own option, which in most cases was no podía nadie. I classified it as an SN example.
Susana NEG passed the exam

b) Susana no ha pasado su examen.

Susana NEG has passed her exam

c) Susana no pasó el examen no.

Susana NEG passed the exam NEG

‘Susana did not pass the exam’

First negative mention:

¿Por qué le pasó eso?

why to her happened that

‘Why did it happen to her?’

a) Porque no estudió no.

because NEG studied NEG

b) Porque no ha estudiado.

because NEG has studied

c) Porque no estudió.

because NEG studied

‘Because she did not study (NEG)’

The example in (3) is different from previous example in (2), because the first question-answer pair adds the information to the context rather than ‘activates’ the negative context. The second question-answer explains further the answer of the first question-answer pair, rather than intensifying the answer of the first question-answer pair. Out of nine target scenarios (18 question-answer pairs), there were seven question-answer pairs with first negative mention and five question-answer pairs with second negative mention. The other six question-answer pairs were fillers.

The last variable tested in this task is the use and type of other negative words, as in (4):
Participants took between 15-20 minutes to complete this task. Based on participants’ answers, I was able to find out which linguistic and social factors favoured the appearance of ND.

3.3.4 Sentence Completion Task

The third task was the Sentence Completion Task. Participants heard nine incomplete scenarios interrupted by dog’s barking and had to complete each sentence. A sample scenario is provided in (5).

(5)  
Luis pinta todos los días y María se supone que practique el piano. Ella no toca el piano suficiente porque prefiere salir con sus amigos. En cuanto al arte y la música lo importante es practicar. Luis pinta a diario pero María no (el perro está ladrando) ...

‘Luis draws every day and Maria, supposedly, practices piano. She does not play piano enough because she prefers to go out with her friends. As for art and music, practice is important. Luis draws every day, but Maria does not… (the dog is barking)’
This task tested for first negative mention, where negation was presupposed but not explicitly used, as in (6), or second negative mention negation, where the negator no was explicitly used after SN, as in (7).

(6) Jorge y Gustavo se fueron a Puebla a comer. Normalmente, Jorge va a Puebla 2 o 3 veces por semana. Sin embargo, a Gustavo le gusta estar en Chipilo y por eso no (el perro está ladrando) ...

‘Jorge and Gustavo went to eat in Puebla. Usually, Jorge comes to Puebla twice or three times a week. However, Gustavo prefers to stay in Chipilo and that is why NEG (the dog is barking) …’

Expected answer: No va a Puebla

‘He does not go to Puebla’

(7) Juan está acostado. Hace una hora le llamó Rodrigo y le preguntó si quería ir a una fiesta con él. Juan le dijo que no quería porque estaba cansado. Sin embargo, suena el teléfono. Es Rodrigo. Le pregunta otra vez si quiere ir con él porque no quiere ir solo. Juan no cambia de opinión y le dice que no. Entonces, Rodrigo va a la fiesta, pero Juan no quiere (el perro está ladrando ...)

‘Juan is lying down. Rodrigo called him an hour ago to ask whether he wanted to go to a party with him. Juan told him he did not feel like going as he was tired. However, the phone rings. It is Rodrigo. He asks Juan again whether he wants to come with him as he does not want to go alone. Juan does not change his mind and he tells him ‘no’. So, Rodrigo goes to the party, but Juan does not (the dog is barking) …’

Expected answer: No quiere ir no

‘He does not want to go NEG’
In (6), since *no* appears only at the end of the utterance right before the dog’s barking, it is treated as first negative mention. In this case, since there is no second negative mention in the given sentence, ND is not expected. In (7), on the other hand, since single negation with first negative mention is introduced, the last clause, which participants have to complete, is an example of second negative mention. Therefore, ND will be expected to occur.

There were no practice scenarios prior to the task. Participants took between five and seven minutes to complete this task.

### 3.3.5 Sentence Repetition Task

The last task was a Sentence Repetition Task, which consisted of 41 isolated stimuli for the participants to repeat. There was no utterances to practice, but participants could hear the same utterances as many times as needed. Stimuli were recorded by a native speaker who produced separate words. Using Audacity software, a robotic sounding version of each word was created by lowering the pitch by 14%, adding Echo effects, setting the delay time to .015 and the decay factor to .65. Then, the Tempo effects were decreased by 10% and repeated the above procedure with Echo. Words were then concatenated into sentences. Participants heard a sentence with a flat intonation and were asked to help a “robot” learn to speak Spanish from the region by repeating the sentence using their normal intonation. Participants’ repetitions were recorded.

Out of 41 sentences, there were 18 target sentences and 23 distractors. They were controlled for the linguistic variables (described in section 2.5): syntactic category of the previous adjacent word (verb (*n*=4), noun (*n*=2), adverb (*n*=2), adjectival phrase (*n*=2), or negative pronoun (*n*=1) and use of negative words (*nadie* ‘nobody’, *ningún* ‘no one’). Target sentences included three sentences with two negators (8), six with the preverbal negative word and final *no* (9), and six with preverbal *no*, postverbal negative word, and additional negation (10).

(8) **NEG–V–NEG**  
    **Juan no  trabaja  no**  
    Juan NEG works **NEG**
‘Juan does not work’

(9)  NEG word –V–NEG  Nadie  trabaja  no
nobody works  NEG

‘Nobody works NEG’

(10)  NEG–V–NEG word  No  trabaja nadie  no
NEG  works  nobody  NEG

‘Nobody works’

There were also three sentences with one single negator (NEG V), as in (11), and six with affirmative tag questions, as in (12), which were used to compare the contours with ND (9) to ensure participants produced the final falling contour.

(11)  Juan  no  trabaja.
Juan  NEG  works
‘Juan does not work’.

(12)  Todos  trabajan  aquí  ¿no?
all  work  here  NEG

‘Everybody works here, right?’

All sentences contained similar verbs for SN and ND options: Juan no trabaja ‘Juan does not work (NEG)’, nadie trabaja (no) ‘Nobody works (NEG)’. Having the same verbs, as well as an overall similar structure in various sentences, proved useful when analyzing the final contour and identifying similarities and differences between various types of sentences.

Fourteen distractor sentences included interrogative and exclamative sentences, unrelated to the experiment, as in (13):

(13)  ¿Juan  llegó  a qué hora?
Juan  arrived  at what time?

‘What time did Juan arrive at?’
A few sentences did not have any negative words, as in previous examples (n=9).

The presence of ND was determined by analyzing the intonation contour of the sentence. If the contour was falling (L*L%), it was coded as ND. In contrast, if it was rising (LH%) at the end of the utterance, it was considered a tag question and not ND. The presence of a pause was another indicator of whether the final no was part of ND or a tag. If there was no pause before final no, then it was treated as ND. If there was a pause between the final no and a previous constituent then it was analysed as a tag question, as part of SN. Participants took between 15-20 minutes to complete this task.

### 3.3.6 Summary of the Tasks

Overall, a variety of tasks was created in order to elicit a higher number of utterances with ND. More specifically, the incorporation of four tasks allowed me to determine which linguistic and social factor(s) favoured ND. Also, each task tested different factors. For example, an Elicited Speech task was designed to reveal whether ND was frequent in the discourse of Chipileños in natural, semi-controlled speech. However, given that the first task was semi-spontaneous and short, one could not rely on getting a sufficient number of ND contexts to produce quantitatively significant results. Thus, experimental tasks were used to augment the number of ND contexts, as well as to control for the linguistic factors that might not emerge in the conversation. Data from the Sentence Repetition Task was used to determine whether the final contour had a falling or rising intonation. This task examined all social factors and two linguistic factors (previous adjacent constituent and other negative words). The other linguistic factor, preceding negative mention, was omitted because of the nature of the task, which only contained isolated sentences. In contrast, the Sentence Completion Task controlled for previous negative mention and social factors. The Forced Choice Preference Task controlled for use of other negative words, negative mention, and all social factors. However, that task was not spontaneous: the speech of the participants was manipulated by the specific context scenarios. In other words, the formal structure of the task reduced the spontaneity and casualness of the speech.
3.4 Procedure

Prior to completing the questionnaire and recording the tasks, a consent form was given to the participants to sign, accompanied by a consent letter describing the research in more detail. I explained to the participants that all information would be used solely for the dissertation, related presentations, and publications; no personal information was to be revealed. Also, I pointed out that upon completion of all four tasks, they would be provided monetary compensation. After signing the form, all participants were asked to complete a background questionnaire. I grouped and coded the participants according to their answers on this questionnaire. Participants were grouped based on social criteria, including parents’ ethnicity, sex, and their age (e.g., CHFJ1 is a Chipileño with both Chipileño parents, female, aged 18-34 (joven ‘young’), first such speaker recorded; CHMHJ3 is a Chipileño with a Chipileño mother, male (hombre ‘male), aged 18-34 (joven ‘young’), third such speaker recorded, CHPFV2 is a Chipileño with a Chipileño father, female, aged 35+ (viejo23 ‘old’), second such speaker recorded; MFV1 is a monolingual-speaking, female, aged 35+ (viejo ‘old’)), first such speaker recorded).

All participants did the tasks in the following order: a directed conversation, a Forced Choice Preference Task, a Sentence Completion Task, and a Sentence Repetition Task. This order was used to first create familiarity with the procedure and then conduct more technical and complex tasks. Sometimes, I did the preference task after the completion task to control for naturalistic speech and avoid priming effect, especially if participants were living in the same house and could somehow listen to some tasks when the other member of the family was being recorded. After all tasks were completed, I asked the participants informally about the tasks and the overall study. Since most of the participants realized the study was on ND phenomenon, a few of them shared their knowledge and opinions about the incorporation of final no in Spanish. Some of the excerpts are included into the discussion of the phenomenon in Chapter 5.

---

22 See Appendix F and G.
23 In Spanish, the more appropriate term to use for an older speaker is de mayor edad ‘of the older age’. However, I use v abbreviation for viejo to avoid confusion in coding.
Participants took approximately 10-15 minutes to sign the consent form, fill in the sociolinguistic questionnaire, and get introduced to the study and 45 minutes to an hour to complete all tasks. Those participants who decided to share their knowledge on the ND phenomenon and their perception of its occurrence stayed a little longer. Tasks were completed on the same day unless participants decided otherwise.24 I was cautious about the condition of each speaker. If I noticed tiredness or boredom, I gave the participant a break. After collecting the data from all participants, I coded the data into Excel and analyzed segments using Praat. After that, I conducted statistical analyses of participants’ data.

3.5 Data analysis

3.5.1 Transcription and Coding

Interviews were partially transcribed using the ELAN software program. Orthographical transcriptions included all utterances in which participants used negation (one negator or two negators) in order to observe and compare the scope of variation of ND. Transcriptions included utterances of the preceding context and the actual sentence containing the negation, in order to understand better the environment for ND use and better code the linguistic variables. Excerpts from the interviews were then inputted into Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2011) in order to determine a final boundary tone. If the final boundary tone is HL%, as in Figure 3.1, it is treated as a characteristic of ND; if the final boundary tone is LH%, as in Figure 3.2, it is treated as a tag question, which is part of SN.

24 Two participants decided to have the tasks divided into two days due to lack of time.
Figure 3.1. Pitch track of *no, no vino no* ‘No, he did not come NEG’ produced by a Chipileño participant

Figure 3.2. Pitch track *Jorge no come las enchiladas no* ‘Jorge does not eat enchiladas, no?’ produced by a Chipileño participant

In order to determine the type of contour, I compared the pitch movement associated with the preceding lexical item and the final *no*: if the final pitch was lower than the pitch associated with the preceding lexical word, a typical falling contour in a declarative sentence, it was a characteristic of ND. In contrast, if the final pitch on the final *no* had a rise associated with ‘no’, it was analyzed as a tag question. Given that speakers in interviews produced longer and faster sentences, it was sometimes hard to measure pauses. In the other three tasks, pauses were taken into consideration.
After the analysis in Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2011), I exported the data of all negative utterances to Excel, along with the coding of the contour, and coded them based on the three independent linguistic variables: previous adjacent constituents (verb, noun, negative pronoun, negative determiner phrase, or adverb), use of other negative words (tampoco ‘neither’, nadie ‘nobody’, nada ‘nothing’, or its absence) and final no, same or different verb, previous negative mention (first or second), and social variables (sex, age, and parents’ ethnicity).

For the second task, the Forced Choice Preference Task, all options of SN and ND were extracted. The option with ND was examined using Praat to make sure the final no had a falling contour. Another indicator of the production of ND was the presence of pauses. If it was not clear from the auditory impression that the F0 contour was clearly falling, I looked at the existence of pauses between the previous constituent and no. In some cases, it was hard to define whether there was a pause or not. Then, I compared two or three different excerpts of the same speaker and only then decided what contour it resembled. Sometimes, cases were not clear examples of one or the other and thus were excluded from the study. If, however, there was no obvious pause, then the sentence was treated as ND, where final no and the preceding element formed one single constituent (refer to Figure 3.1); otherwise, it was treated as two different constituents and thus not ND (refer to Figure 3.2). The responses were then coded in Excel according to linguistic independent variables: use of other negative words (tampoco ‘neither’ and nadie ‘nobody’) or absence thereof, use of the same or a different verb from the question, and negative mention in the preceding discourse (first negative mention or second negative mention). They were also coded according to three social variables (sex, age, and parents’ ethnicity).

For the Sentence Completion Task, responses were transcribed in ELAN. I classified the final contour auditorily and confirmed it with Praat analysis afterwards. The utterances were coded for linguistic (first or second negative mention) and social variables (sex, age, and parents’ ethnicity).

For the Sentence Repetition Task, final contours were analyzed in Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2011). The final contours were either coded as ND based on the falling contour and pauses, or as the “other” category. The “other” category included cases of tag questions or SN, because both options are grammatical in the Mexican standard variety. The utterances were also coded for
linguistic variables (previous negative constituent (verb, noun, adverb, negative determiner phrase or negative pronoun), use (or its absence) and position (preverbal, postverbal) of other negative words) and all social variables.

3.5.4 Exclusions

A number of tokens were excluded during the analysis of the data in ELAN. In the elicited speech task (interviews), answers with only one negation no (14), or sentential negation in the main clause followed by a dependent clause (15), were excluded from the analysis (n=274).

(14) I: ¿Nació en Italia?
    ‘Were you born in Italy?’

    CHFV1: No
    ‘No’

    I: ¿Y sus padres?
    ‘And your parents?’

    CHFV1: No
    ‘No’

    Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

(15) CHFJ5: No hay una instrucción en cuanto al idioma pero sería bueno porque si no es más fácil que se pierda.
    ‘There is no instruction for the language [Veneto], but it would be good, because if not it is easier that it would get lost’.

    Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34
In the Forced Choice Preference Task, 50 tokens out of 869 possible tokens were excluded because one of the answers in each question-answer pair was ungrammatical or illogical. For example, *no, vino no* (‘no, [she] came NEG’), is ungrammatical in both Veneto and Spanish due to the licensing principles of the negation. In both varieties, one negator has to occur in the preverbal position to license the scope of the whole sentence and check the [+NEG] feature. It is not clear whether participants picked ungrammatical options due to confusion, hearing, or other factors. With regard to possible confusion or hearing problems, participants asked me to repeat a scenario if they did not hear it the first time. In other words, I ensured that participants could clearly hear and understand a given task.

In the Sentence Completion Task, 59 tokens out of a total of 395 possible cases were excluded given that the participants either stopped after *no*, as in (16), or used a dependent clause with *porque* ‘because’, as in (17).

(16) *Rossana se va a vivir sola el próximo año pero aun no sabe cocinar. Entonces cada semana su mamá le enseña preparar cosas nuevas. Sin embargo, Rossana nunca puede recordar los ingredientes. La mamá siempre le dice a Rossana que tiene que anotar todo en su libreta, pero Rossana no*  

‘Rossana will be living alone next year but she still does not know how to cook. Every week her mother teaches her new recipes. However, Rossana can never remember the ingredients. Her mother always tells Rossana to write it down but Rossana NEG’

CHH21: *pero Rossana no. Nunca va a ser buena cocinera*  

‘but Rossana no. She will never be a good cook’

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

(17) *Hay tres trapos en la mesa. Luisa estaba limpiando todo el día pero se enfadó porque solo un trapo limpia bien sin dejar ninguna mancha. En cuanto a limpiar bien, un trapo limpia perfectamente bien pero los otros dos no...*  

‘There are three cleaning rags on the table. Luisa had been cleaning the whole day but she got frustrated because only one rag cleans well without leaving any stains. In terms of cleaning well, one rag cleans perfectly well but the other two NEG...’

CHFV5: *pero los otros dos porque están ... pues está sucio el trapo*  

‘but the other two because they are... Well, the rag is dirty’

Chipileño female, whose both parents are Chipileños, aged 35-70
In the Repetition Task, cases of repetition without a normal intonation (i.e., resembling a robotic voice) were excluded (total of 50 tokens of out possible 1422 sentences).

3.5.2 Quantitative analysis

The data was coded and analyzed in Goldvarb examining first the distributional patterns and then determining the “best model” by running a series of binomial step-up/step-down and one-level logistic regression analyses with negation type as the dependent variable and ND as the application value. A model shows patterns of variation between two variants and the effect of social and linguistic factors on the distribution of ND. The stepwise (step-up/step-down) regression analysis compared different models, either starting with the least complex (one independent factor) or the most complex (all independent factors) model by adding or eliminating factor groups according to their significance. Once a model showed that no more significant parameters could be added or excluded, the stepping up or stepping down stopped. In other words, both analyses were symmetrical and showed which factor group(s) was/were significant (Paolillo, 2002, p.85). Specifically, the significance represented the significance level of the log likelihood-ratio comparison of one model with the best model. One-level analysis was the simpler version of step-up/step-down analysis and provided a summary of factor group effects. Conducting these two types of analyses allowed me to determine the significance of independent factors on the production of ND in each task by interpreting the probability of ND through the effect of factor weights in each factor group. In the tables in Chapter 4, if the factor group was significant, the range was shown. This was determined by calculating the difference between the values of the highest and lowest factor weights within the factor group. I then compared models between various subgroups of participants in order to see if there was a significant effect between social and linguistic factors on the distribution of ND.

The four tasks investigated different subsets of the independent variables, as summarized in Table 3.2.
Table 3. 2. Summary of the independent variables examined in each task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Forced Choice Preference Task</th>
<th>Sentences Completion Task</th>
<th>Sentence Repetition Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ ethnicity</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous adjacent element (verb, noun, pronoun, adverb or determiner phrase)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative mention (first or second) based on preceding context</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of negative word (or its absence)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of negative words (pre- or postverbal)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of negative word</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of the verb (same or different)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the regression analysis of each task, individual analysis of the participants who showed variation in their answers was conducted to investigate whether the production of ND corresponded to the tasks or to their own repertoire. To do so, I compared their rate of ND use in each task to see whether there was a preference for ND in a given task. If there was no relation between task and ND, then I interpreted the results as individually determined.

3.5.3 Qualitative Analysis

The elicited speech was partially transcribed and used to show cases of ND and other forms of negation in spontaneous speech. I transcribed all instances of negation, including SN or ND. The other open-ended questions (e.g., differences about bilingual and monolingual speech,
generational differences, participant’s perception about their own speech, attitudes of monolingual speakers towards Chipileños) were also transcribed to support the overall discussion on the interactions between Chipileños and monolingual Spanish speakers. Finally, the later informal conversations with participants were also transcribed and used to better understand and describe the situation between the two languages in Chipilo. Excerpts that contained mention and discussion of ND were used in the project to understand the speakers’ perspective on the phenomenon. Also, I transcribed conversations that included the speaker’s attitudes towards their language, the community, and Chipileños, as a group. The later were relevant since they allowed me to interpret the results better, specifically the significance of independent factors on elicitation of ND. Participants’ perception on the community, language, or attitudes allowed me to see whether a specific group perceived negative tensions towards them by a monolingual group. Since my Master’s thesis showed a correlation between negative attitudes and Chipileño identity, the responses from this dissertation could possibly explain the use of ND among specific social group(s) due to the above two factors.
Chapter 4
Results

4.1 Overview

This chapter describes the results of four tasks: an elicited conversation and three controlled tasks that followed (a Forced Choice Preference Task, a Sentence Completion Task, and a Sentence Repetition Task). These tasks were designed to investigate i) the relative frequency of ND, as compared to SN ii) which linguistic factors condition the occurrence of ND, and iii) which social factors favour the use of ND. The distributional analysis of ND and SN is provided for all tasks. A regression model of the tokens, produced by speakers exhibiting variation during the Forced Choice Preference Task and the Sentence Repetition Task, follows. Only bilingual speakers are analyzed, since none of the monolingual Mexican speakers used ND in their answers. I then report the overall percentage of participants, categorized according to the social variables, who categorically produced the standard variant (SN) as opposed to a mixed set of SN and ND, followed by the regression model to show the distribution of speakers with variant and invariant behaviour. Finally, an individual analysis of four participants who predominantly used ND is provided in order to investigate whether ND use is task-related or individual-related. Analysing the overall results, we could then determine whether social factors override linguistic ones in the elicitation of the phenomenon.

4.2 Elicited speech conversation / Interview
The first task was an elicited conversational speech. I anticipated occurrences of ND in interviews, based on preliminary research. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of SN and ND among 79 speakers. This accounts for a total of 310 tokens.

Table 4.1. Overall distribution of tokens (in absolute numbers and percentages) of negative doubling (ND) and standard variant of negation (SN) in the elicited conversational speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of negation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative doubling (ND)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard negation (SN)</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that the standard negation (a single sentential negation or a tag) was the preferred variant in the community, whereas the ND variant occurred only 1% (n=4) of the time. Most of the instances with SN occurred with first negative mention and with all types of previous constituents. (e.g., noun, adverb, pronoun). Out of the total of 306 SN cases, only 26 of them occurred after the second negative mention, and with verb as a previous constituent (refer to (5) and (6)). As for the ND cases, all four tokens of ND occurred with the verb as a previous constituent and second negative mention, as predicted in Hypothesis II a and b.

I now turn to discussing excerpts from the spontaneous speech in more detail. Taking into consideration the linguistic factors, examined in this dissertation, examples (1-4) illustrate the use of ND with a second negative mention, immediately preceded by first negative mention. Three of the four examples show the use of ND in contexts with different verbs when we compare the verbs in SN and ND. As mentioned in Chapter 2, identity of verb is determined in relation to the immediately previous verb used, either in the same sentence or the previous one.

(1)  I: ¿Y cómo les perciben los mexicanos?

‘And how do monolingual speakers perceive you [Chipileños]?’

CHMFV2: No creo que se noten, bueno... no se nota no. A lo mejor si un chipileño llega a Puebla, le dicen que tienes un acento raro.
‘I do not think they notice, well… one does not notice NEG. Maybe when a Chipileño arrives in Puebla, they say you have a weird accent’.

Chipileño female, whose mother is Chipileño, aged 35-70

In (1), the participant responds that monolingual speakers do not notice any difference between them and Chipileños. In other words, the first sentence ‘activates’ the participant’s response, whereas the second sentence reinstates the same idea with the use of second negative mention. This illustrates one piece of support for the hypothesis that ND would be favoured in contexts in second negative mention. With regard to the verb, in both sentences, the main verb is different creer “to believe” and notar “to notice”, which supports the initial Hypothesis of occurrence of ND with different verbs in SN and ND.

Example (2) demonstrates that ND is also used in context with a second negative mention after the speaker negates the idea of character traits in specific individuals.

(2)  I: ¿Y qué es lo que no te gusta de Chipilo?

‘And what is there that you do not like about Chipilo?

CHH24: Pues a veces el carácter de algunas personas no me gusta pero nada inconveniente, que-no se puede arreglar no.

Well, sometimes the character of some people does not please me, but there is nothing inconvenient that one cannot resolve NEG.

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

Again in (2), the participant first introduces his idea, using SN in the first clause, followed by continuation of the same idea in the following clause, i.e., second negative mention. Similar to (1), ND was predicted to occur with this context.

The corresponding intonation represented in Figure 4.1 shows that no in example (2) has a falling contour on the final no, which is a characteristic of ND.
With regard to type of verb, the second verb *arreglar* ‘fix’ is different from the first verb *gustar* ‘like’. Based on the initial Hypothesis, ND would be favoured with the different verb as in the previous sentence. In the present example, the speaker uses the final *no* after the first negative mention with SN. My preliminary research (Tararova, 2014) found a few instances where ND occurred with a different verb from a previous sentence. In example (2), this is again the case.

Example (3) is similar to example (2) in the sense that ND is used with a different verb from the preceding negated phrase, as well as second negative mention.

(3)  **CHPH22**: *Como soy moreno, nada más se ríen,* no me van a entender, o sea no me creen no.

Given that I am dark skinned, they [non-Chipileños] just laugh. They won’t understand me, in other words they don’t trust me **NEG**.

Chipileño male, whose father is Chipileño, aged 35-70

In (3), the participant uses the two different verbs in two clauses, which supports the initial Hypothesis. Similar to other two examples, ND occurs in the context with second negative
mention, which is preceded by first negative mention. In both cases, the participant talks about the same idea. Therefore, based on the initial Hypothesis, ND was predicted to occur.

Example (4) also shows that ND occurs in the clause with second negative mention. In (4), similar to the other three examples, the verbs are different.

(4) CHFV7: ...Hay personas, que como que crítican como que no les gusta no.

Nos llaman extranjeros.

‘There are people who, like, criticize, like, they do not like it [hearing Veneto]

NEG. They call us foreigners’.

Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

What is interesting about example (4) in comparison to the other above examples is that the first clause does not have an explicit SN (NEG V), but rather the verb ‘criticize’. The word *critican* ‘(they) criticize’, however, seems to bring a negative connotation to the sentence, so it might be the case that ND is used as a marker of the implicit negation. In this case, *critican* could be treated as SN followed by the ND. Future research can determine whether these types of verbs affect the occurrence of ND.

To sum up, ND in examples (1-4) occurs with verb as a previous constituent. ND in three examples (2-4) contains a different verb from SN. In line with Hypothesis I, all four of these examples show the occurrence of ND with second negative mention. However, due to the fact that the results only show four cases with ND, there is very weak support for the initial hypotheses. Moreover, as mentioned at the beginning of this section, there were also 26 SN cases out of a total of 306 instances which appeared with the second negative mention. The next two examples (5-6) show that ND does not always occur in the context with the same negative idea, although both first negative mention and second negative mention are present. It is important to mention though, that 300 cases appeared in different linguistic environments, so we can assume that SN does not occur with second negative mention that often.

(5) I: ¿Y cuáles cosas no te gustan de Chipilo?

‘And what things do you not like in Chipilo?’
CHHJ1: *Unas cosas que no me gustan... uhm... la entrada de narco... es una de las cosas que no me gusta nada*

‘Some things that I do not like... hmm... the ‘entrance’ of drug dealers... it is one of the things I do not like at all.’

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

(6) CHHJ2: *A veces usan unas palabras que nosotros, los jóvenes, ya no usamos o al revés, pues nosotros *usamos* palabras que los viejos ya no *usan*.*

‘Sometimes [the older speakers] use some words that us, young speakers do not already use or vice versa, well we use some words that the elders do not use already’.

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

In (5) and (6), ND could potentially have been used in contexts with a second negative mention, and with the verb as a previous constituent. If we compare (5) and (6) however: in (5) there is no second final *no*; instead in (5) the participant uses *nada* ‘nothing’ as a marker of reinforcement, in place of *no*. In other words, what we see in (5) and (6) is the following: although each speaker expresses the same idea in two sentences, in both of which negative mention is shown, participants produce SN in both sentences. Therefore, as seen from the distributional analysis, ND is an infrequent variant in this task. Thus, overall, the conversational speech produced only weak support for the hypotheses about the linguistic factors.

Most directly relevant to this study however, four of the participants commented on the use of the final *no*, as seen from (7-10).

(7) CPHHJ7: *A veces hay repetición de palabras que las personas que no tienen*
el véneto, no lo hacen. Normalmente habla de … cuando se niega algo usamos a veces el no. ‘No vine el otro día contigo no’.\(^{25}\) Por ejemplo, con mi novia: quiere pronunciar algunas cosas en véneto pero no le sale...

‘Sometimes, there is a repetition of words, which people who do not speak Veneto, do not do. Normally, speaking of… when something is negated, sometimes we use no. ‘I did not come with you the other day NEG’. For example, with my girlfriend: she wants to pronounce some things in Veneto, but it does not come right’

I: *Y este ‘no’ que mencionaste, ¿qué significado tiene?*

‘And this ‘no’ that you have mentioned, what meaning does it have?’

CHPHJ7: *No sé. Yo creo que es para reiterar la idea o reconfirmar la idea pero no sabré decirte cuál es.*

‘I do not know. I believe it is used to assert the idea or to reconfirm the idea but I wouldn’t know which one it is’.

Chipileño male, whose father is Chipileño, aged 18-34

(8) I: *¿Y cuáles son unas cosas específicas del español de los Chipileños?*

‘And what are some specific things of Chipileño Spanish?’

CHHJ2: *Ah, por ejemplo, cuando decimos ‘no te lo presto no’.*

... *es como afirmar la negación, como que estar seguro de que no es.*

‘Ah, for example, when we say “I do not lend it to you NEG.” It is like to confirm the negation, like to be sure that it is not’.

\(^{25}\) Given that these examples are part of quoted speech, these instances were excluded from the distributional analysis.
Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

(9) CHFJ1: …*si hay mezcla de las palabras con el véneto... como la doble negación.*

‘Yes, there is a mixture of words [in Spanish] with Veneto… like double negation’

I: ¿*Y qué es?*

‘And what is it?’

CHFJ1: *Pues que en véneto pues se escucha bien y se entiende pero cuando lo dices en español ya lo ponemos otro significado y ya como que disturba la frase.*

‘Well, in Veneto it sounds good and it is normal, but in Spanish no, it “disturbs” the sentence’

I: *Y dame un ejemplo…*

Give me an example

CHFJ1: *Como que no puedo salir no*

‘Like I cannot leave NEG’

Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-35

(10) I: ¿*Y hay algunas estructuras que ustedes dicen que son diferentes a la gente que no habla el véneto?*

‘And are there any structures that you [Chipileños] say that are different from people who do not speak Veneto?’

CHFJ5: *Aha, un ‘no’ al final. Como por ejemplo, como “no fui no a ver esto”, esto es un poco silvestre pero sí mucha gente lo hace.*

Yes, a final no, like for example, like “I did not go NEG to see it; this is a little ‘wild’ but many people do it’.

Chipileño female whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34.
Based on the participant’s responses from examples (7-10), certain generalizations can be made. First, out of four examples, three of them had a verb as the immediate previous constituent (i.e., NEG V NEG), which suggests that verbs as previous constituents may favour ND, as predicted in the initial Hypothesis. Second, the two participants in (7) and (8) mentioned that the purpose of the final *no* was to reconfirm or reinforce the negation, supporting the initial Hypothesis. These observations seem to be consistent with the actual four ND uses under discussion.

Besides, the above participants notice that Chipileños sometimes use ND; moreover, they do not state that the phenomenon occurs in the speech of a subgroup (i.e. young vs. older, educated vs. uneducated, males vs. females, etc.), but rather among a lot of people in the community, as was stated in (10).

Through the analysis, I identified four other cases of negation, which are neither ND nor SN. All three of them are Type III negation, where negation occurs postverbally only: V + NEG. They are listed in (11)-(14).

(11) I: ¿*Y el véneto hablado en Segusino es diferente del véneto hablado aquí?*

    ‘And is Veneto spoken in Segusino different from Veneto spoken here?’

    CHFV3: *No, es igual no.*

    ‘No, it is the same.’

    Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

Figure 4.2 shows that the final *no* has a falling contour, a characteristic of ND. The participant however, did not use the preverbal *no*. Yet, the use of final *no* is felicitous in the above context, as it seems to represent a contrastive focus between a positive expected response (e.g., “yes, it is different”) and the actual response.
Figure 4.2. Pitch Track (#11) *Es igual no* ‘it is the same NEG’ in Spanish realized by a Chipileño female (35-70)

The same speaker used the final *no* with a falling contour and the same adverb *igual* ‘same’ later in the conversation, (12).

(12) CHFV3: *Yo creo que no, es igual no*

‘I think no, it is the same NEG’

Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

Similar to (11), example (12) is the contrastive response to a question. (12) shows that another speaker uses the final *no* to present contrastive information of a question – response pair. Example (13) also contains the adverb *igual* ‘same’ and final *no*.

(13) I: *¿Y el véneto hablado en Segusino es diferente del véneto hablado aquí?*

‘And is Veneto spoken in Segusino different from Veneto spoken here?’

CHFV6: *Igual no*.

‘Same NEG’.

Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70
Figure 4. 3. Pitch Track (#13) Igual no ‘Same no’ in Spanish, realized by a Chipileño female (35-70)

Example (14) is produced by the same speaker as (13).

(14) I: ¿Y qué partes de Italia le gustaría conocer?

‘And what parts of Italy would like to get to know?’

CHFV6: Pues de donde vienen los abuelos no.

‘Well, (the one) where our grandparents come from NEG.’

Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

Figure 4. 4. Pitch Track (#14) De donde vienen los abuelos no ‘Where the grandparents come from’ in Spanish realized by a Chipileño female (35-70)
The pattern illustrated in (14) is more complex. The participant (CHFV6) presupposes that the information she is communicating is already known; in other words, she thinks that the knowledge of Italian immigration to Mexico from Treviso is shared between her and the interviewer. She also might have simply forgotten the name of the place where her family came from and therefore, uses final no, as marker of consensus seeking.

Finally, the participant in (15) also uses a final no, that seem to be similar in function to (14).

(15) CHMHJ1: *Pues, la gente cuando lo escucha dice ‘¿qué es eso? ¿qué hablas?*  

*Es admiración no.*  

‘Well, when people hear it [Veneto] they ask “What is it? What language are you speaking? It is admiration NEG.’

Chipileño participant, whose mother is Chipileño, aged 18-34

Figure 4.5. Pitch Track (#15) *Es admiración no* ‘It is admiration NEG’ in Spanish, realized by a Chipileño male (18-34)

The use of final no in (15) is also complex. It seems to resemble a tag question where final no can be part of a rhetorical question or as information seeking. In other words, the participant, on the one hand, may have used the final no to reaffirm his point about admiration towards Veneto without need for the actual response, or on the other hand, he can use no as a marker of seeking the response.

To summarize the above uses, NEG III (V-NEG) was used in restricted response contexts only with the function of a contrast of shared knowledge between a speaker and a hearer or as a tag
with a function of information seeking. Based on the above examples, Type III negation was used with the adverb igual ‘same’ as the previous constituent in three instances and preceded by a noun in one instance. Since the focus of this dissertation is not on NEG III, these observations are left for future research.

4.3 Forced Choice Preference Task

The second task that the participants completed was a Forced Choice Preference Task. They heard a scenario such as in (19), followed up with two questions, for which three possible responses were given. Participants listened to the scenario and questions with responses and then picked a preferred option, which was either an SN (19a), an option with ND (19b), or an ungrammatical option (19c).26

(19)  
Ana cumplió años el lunes pero decidió hacer su fiesta el sábado anterior porque nadie podía venir el lunes.

‘Ana had her birthday on Monday but she decided to have her party on Saturday before her birthday because nobody could make it on Monday’.

¿Hizo Ana su fiesta de cumpleaños el lunes?

did Ana her party of birthday Monday

‘Did Ana have her birthday on Monday?’

a) No, no la hizo el lunes.

no, NEG it she.did Monday

a) No, no la hizo no.

no, NEG it she.did NEG

---

26 The only possible use is preterit, given that the event is presented in reference to a specific time in the past.
b) *No, no la hacía el lunes no.*

no, no it she.did Monday NEG

‘No, she did not (NEG)’

Then, participants were invited to repeat aloud the chosen option. This procedure was put in place to ensure the final contour of final no was typical of ND, i.e., a falling contour, and not a rising contour indicative of a tag question. In this task, I controlled for negative mention in each question –pair (first mention for the first question-pair or second mention for the second question-pair) in a preceding context, use of the same or different verb in question-pair responses, and absence or use of other negative words (*nadie* ‘nobody’ and *tampoco* ‘neither’), as shown in (20).

(20) *Rosario organizó una fiesta en su casa, pero nadie se presentó, ni siquiera su mejor amiga, Ana.*

**First negative mention:**

¿*Vino alguien a la fiesta de Rosario?*

came anybody to the party of Rosario

‘Did anybody come to Rosario’s party?’

a) *No, nadie vino/ no, no vino nadie*

no, nobody came/ no, NEG came nobody

b) *No, vino nadie*

no, came nobody

c) *No, nadie vino no*

no, nobody came NEG

‘No, nobody came’

**Second negative mention:**

¿*Vino la mejor amiga de Rosario, Ana?*
came the best friend of Rosario, Ana

‘Did Rosario’s best friend, Ana come?’

a) No, tampoco vino.

no, neither she came

b) No, no vino tampoco no

no, NEG she came neither NEG

c) No, vino no

No, she came NEG

‘No [she] did not come (either)

112 participants were recorded conducting this task. 91 participants categorically selected and produced a standard variant. All 34 monolingual Spanish speakers categorically produced SN. 21 of 83 bilingual speakers produced a mixed set of ND and the standard variant. Table 4.3 shows the distribution of forms among the 21 speakers showing variability. This accounts for a total of 217 tokens out of 913 cases (11 contexts x 83 bilingual participants) – the other tokens were selected by bilingual speakers with an invariant pattern.

Table 4.2. Overall distribution (in absolute numbers and percentages) of negative doubling (ND) and standard variant (SN) in Forced Choice Preference Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of negation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative doubling</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard negation</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N</strong></td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that a standard variant is used 65% of the time among speakers who alternate. This supports Hypothesis I, the prediction that the standard negation would be predominantly used, particularly if these numbers are considered in conjunction with the number of people who always used SN and are excluded here.

Table 4.3 shows the distribution of the ND variable with respect to each variant of the independent variables, as well as the factor weight (FW), which shows how much ND is
favoured (or disfavoured) in each context. Table 4.4 includes only the data for speakers with variable behaviour.

Table 4.3. Best model multivariate analysis of the contribution of external and internal factors to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in ** Forced Choice Preference Task;** factor weights selected as significant are bolded; factor weights for factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets in this and following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected mean</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-132.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ ethnicity</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño both parents (CH)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42/126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño mother (CHM)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59/147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger Group (18-34)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58/156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Group (35-70)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18/61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative mention</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50/135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the verb</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49/137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27/80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of negative word</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44/138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampoco</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16/39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this multivariable analysis (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value) parents’ ethnicity and participant’s sex have a significant effect, as seen in Table 4.3. Age group, type of verb, previous negative mention, and the presence and type of other negative words were also tested in the model but do not have any significant effect on the dependent variable in the model selected as best fitting the data.

Participants with two Chipileño parents or a Chipileño father showed a higher proportion of ND usage, as well as higher FWs than the other group. These results partially support Hypothesis III
(b), which stated that participants whose parents are both Chipileños would have a higher rate of ND use. On the other hand, I found that participants with a Chipileño father showed a stronger preference for the ND variant than participants with a Chipileño mother, against expectations. Males showed a higher proportion of ND use than females, which does not support Hypothesis III (c). As for linguistic variables, none of them had a significant effect in this model, so we find no support from this task for the hypotheses related to linguistic factors.

Since parents’ ethnicity and participant’s sex had significant effects, as seen in Table 4.4, I compared the subgroups, males vs. females and CH vs. CHM. vs. CHP, to test whether the subgroups behave the same in terms of favouring factors. Specifically, I tested to see whether there was interaction between sex and other independent (linguistic) factors. Since males showed higher preference for ND in Table 4.3, I tested to see whether there would be any factors, which would contribute significantly to the realization of ND. If results show significant differences in distribution of linguistic factors for males but not for females, we can conclude that males and females behave differently when producing ND.

Table 4.4 shows the comparison between males (n=146) and females (n=71).
Table 4. 4. Best model multivariate analysis of the contribution of external and internal factors to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in Forced Choice Preference Task; factor weights for factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets in this and following tables.

Results are organized separately for each sex group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected mean</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-95.389</td>
<td>-40.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ ethnicity</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22/41</td>
<td>[.51]</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño both parents (CH)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27/64</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño mother (CHM)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9/41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative mention</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42/91</td>
<td>[.48]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16/54</td>
<td>[.53]</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of negative word</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tampoco</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14/26</td>
<td>[.61]</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33/93</td>
<td>[.49]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the verb</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37/92</td>
<td>[.52]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21/54</td>
<td>[.47]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above multivariate analysis (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value), parents’ ethnicity, as well as negative mention and type of negative word, have a significant effect on ND use for males only. The results for male participants with two Chipileño parents or a Chipileño father showed the highest proportion of ND use. These findings suggest that males’ speech might resemble the speech of the participants with Chipileño parents and a Chipileño father, but not a Chipileño mother. In contrast, the results for females show no effect of parents’ ethnicity on the elicitation of ND, except that CHM females produce no ND. With regard to the linguistic factors, as predicted by Hypothesis IIId, second negative mention had a favouring effect on ND use. Negative words, specifically tampoco ‘neither’, had a significant effect on ND elicitation, contrary to initial predictions. In other words, based on these results, males behave differently from females, since we see a significantly different distribution of linguistic factors among males than females.
Now let’s turn to the analysis that contrasts the ethnic groups. Table 4.5 shows the comparison among the three ethnic groups.27

Table 4.5. Best model multivariate analysis of the contribution of external and internal factors to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in the Forced Choice Preference Task; factor weights for factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets in this and following tables. Results are shown for each ethnic group in separate column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>CHM</th>
<th>CHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative mention</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>CHM</th>
<th>CHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the verb</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>CHM</th>
<th>CHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of negative word</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>CHM</th>
<th>CHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampoco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above multivariate analysis (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value), none of the linguistic factors have a significant effect on ND elicitation for any of the three ethnic groups. These results show that the three ethnic groups behave similarly, since there was no favouring effect of any linguistic factor for any of the three groups.

Although age did not have an effect in Table 4.3, I analyzed each age group separately (Table 4.6, younger group) and (Table 4.7, older group), to see whether the ND is a phenomenon of stable sociolinguistic variation or might be a change in progress. If the results show no interaction between age and other independent factors, the results would mean that ND is a phenomenon of stable variation, in terms of conditioning effects (as well as rate of use). Table 4.6 and 4.7 show the distribution of the ND variable with respect to each variant of the independent variables, as well as the factor weights (FW), which shows the contexts where ND

---

27 I also ran the multivariate analysis with one (sex) and two social groups (age and sex), but none of the factors showed a significant effect for any of the three ethnic groups.
is favoured. Table 4.6 shows the distribution among speakers (N=15), showing variability for the younger group (18-34) only, with a total of 155 tokens.

Table 4.6. Best model multivariable analysis of the contribution of external and internal factors selected as significant to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in the Forced Choice Preference Task; factor weights for factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets. Results are shown for the younger group (18-34) only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected mean</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-96.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño both parents (CH)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño mother (CHM)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative mention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16/59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>[.30]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>[.53]</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53/136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of the verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21/57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of negative word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[.47]</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie</td>
<td>[.53]</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampoco</td>
<td>[.58]</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12/28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the multivariable analysis (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value) of the younger speakers showing variability in this task, parents’ ethnicity and negative mention have significant effects, as seen in Table 4.6. Similar to Table 4.4, participants whose parents are both Chipileños and whose father is Chipileño showed a higher proportion of ND preference. With regard to sex, males produced a higher percentage of ND tokens than females, but the effect was not significant in this model. As for linguistic factors, second negative mention had a significant effect on the probability of ND. This supports Hypothesis II: second negative mention will favour the production of ND.

Table 4.7 shows the distribution among the speakers (N=61) showing variability for the older group (35-70), with a total of 61 tokens. Because none of the participants in this age group with a Chipileño mother showed variability in responses, I combined the parental ethnicity and sex
categories of participants who did show variability in their responses. No males whose parents are both Chipileños showed variation in their answers; therefore, they are excluded from the analysis.

Table 4.7. Best model multivariate analysis of the contribution of external and internal factors selected as significant to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in the Forced Choice Preference Task; factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets. Results are shown for the older group (35-70) only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected mean</th>
<th>0.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-34.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FW % N/Total

Parents’ ethnicity and Participant’s sex

| Male & Chipileño father (CHP) | .79 | 60 | 6/10 |
| Female & Chipileño both parents (CH) | .44 | 24 | 12/51 |

Range

Negative mention

| First | [.65] | 42 | 10/24 |
| Second | [.40] | 22 | 8/37 |

Type of the verb

| Same | [.46] | 32 | 12/38 |
| Different | [.57] | 26 | 6/23 |

Presence of negative word

| None | [.42] | 24 | 9/38 |
| Nadie | [.69] | 42 | 5/12 |
| Tampoco | [.59] | 36 | 4/11 |

According to the above multivariate analysis (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value) of the older speakers, the interaction factor combining parents’ ethnicity and participant’s sex has a significant effect, as seen in Table 4.7. More specifically, male participants with a Chipileño father showed a favouring effect of ND preference, resembling the findings in the two previous tables. As in the analysis of all speakers combined, none of the linguistic factors had a significant effect on ND production. Therefore, ND could be a change in progress, since there is no significant effect of second negative mention among older speakers, but only among younger speakers.

In sum, for the Forced Choice Preference Task, as predicted in Hypothesis I, SN was the preferred option among bilingual speakers, where ND occurred at a 35% rate (among speakers who varied in their answers). In terms of linguistic factors, by grouping together and eliminating different social factors (Tables 4.4 – 4.7), the second negative mention variable had a significant effect only in the younger group (18-35), specifically among males. With regard to social
factors, parents’ ethnicity and sex were significant. The participants whose parents are both Chipileños and those whose father alone is Chipileño were significantly more likely to select and produce ND. Males showed a higher probability of ND preference than females when the two age groups were combined, i.e., as in Table 4.4. Therefore, this task shows important findings. First, there might be a slight age effect or difference between younger and older speakers in the factors conditioning ND, since ND was favoured to occur in contexts of second negative mention for the younger group only. Second, with regard to sex, the higher rate of ND among males suggests that their “speech” is different from females. Contrary to the initial Hypothesis, which suggested a higher preference for ND among females, these results showed the opposite effect. Since ND is ungrammatical in standard Spanish, we can consider that ND is a non-standard form. These results about higher use of ND among males corroborate Labovian’s (1991) Principle 1: males show more vernacular forms than females. Thirdly, since the findings show significant effect of ethnicity and sex, we can speculate that males resemble the speech of other males and potentially of their fathers if they are Chipileños. As a result, they use a higher rate of ND. Similarly, since we see preference of SN among females, we can predict that the trend is due to their tighter connection with mothers, rather than fathers or other males; in this sense, females’ speech resemble the speech of other females in the community. Finally, since social factors showed significant effects in most of the analyses, they seem to condition the distribution of the phenomenon more than linguistic ones.

4.4 Sentence Completion Task

The third task that participants performed was the Sentence Completion Task. Participants heard nine scenarios and had to complete each scenario with an appropriate response. Each scenario included a case of second negative mention (n=4) or first negative mention (n=5). First negative mention negation refers to the negation, which was presupposed but not explicitly used, as in (23), and second negative mention refers to the negation immediately following the first negative mention, as in (24). Since the example in (23) introduced first negative mention at the end of the clause, ND was not expected. In contrast, in (24), since SN with first negative
mention “activated” the context, the last clause, which participants had to complete, would be an example of second negative mention. Thus, I expected the occurrence of ND in (24).

(23) **First negative mention:**

Jorge y Gustavo se fueron a Puebla a comer. Normalmente, Jorge va a Puebla 2 o 3 veces por semana. Sin embargo, a Gustavo le gusta estar en Chipilo y por eso no (el perro está ladrando)...

‘Jorge and Gustavo went to eat in Puebla. Usually, Jorge comes to Puebla twice or three times a week. However, Gustavo prefers to stay in Chipilo and that is why he does not (the dog is barking)…’

(24) **Second negative mention:**

Juan está acostado. Hace una hora le llamó Rodrigo y le preguntó si quería ir a una fiesta con él. Juan le dijo que no quería porque estaba cansado. Sin embargo, suena el teléfono. Es Rodrigo. Le pregunta otra vez si quiere ir con él porque no quiere ir solo. Juan no cambia de opinión y le dice que no. Entonces, Rodrigo va a la fiesta, pero Juan no quiere (el perro está ladrando)...

‘Juan is lying down. Rodrigo called him an hour ago to ask whether he wanted to go to a party with him. Juan told him he did not feel like going as he was tired. However, the phone rings. It is Rodrigo. He asks Juan again whether he wants to come with him as he does not want to go alone. Juan does not change his mind and he tells him ‘no’. So, Rodrigo goes to the party, but Juan does not (the dog is barking)…’

112 participants were recorded conducting this task. 108 participants categorically selected and produced a standard variant. All 34 monolingual Spanish speakers categorically produced SN. Four of 83 bilingual speakers produced a mixed set of ND and the standard variant. Table 4.8 shows the distribution of forms among the 4 speakers showing variability with a total of 36 tokens. The other tokens (n=877) were used by bilingual speakers with an invariant SN pattern.
As seen in Table 4.8, the results show that ND occurred only in seven cases out of 36 analyzed tokens in contexts with both second and first negative mentions, therefore rejecting the initial Hypothesis IId, which predicted that second negative mention would favour the production of ND. In other words, we find no support for occurrence of ND with second negative mention only.

Table 4.8. Overall distribution (in absolute numbers and percentages) of negative doubling (ND) and standard variant (SN) in the Sentence Completion Task, for participants exhibiting variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Negators</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First negative mention</td>
<td>56% (n=20)</td>
<td>11% (n=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second negative mention</td>
<td>25% (n=9)</td>
<td>8% (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of tokens</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results comparing contexts with first and second negative mention did not show a significant effect of second mention on ND use ($p=0.429$, Fisher’s Exact Test). It is important, however, to investigate the cases which elicited ND. Three of the seven ND utterances (25-27) show that ND was used with second negative mention.

(25)  *Luis pinta todos los días y María se supone que practique el piano. Ella no toca el piano suficiente porque prefiere salir con sus amigos. En cuanto al arte y la música lo importante es practicar. Luis pinta a diario pero María no...*

‘Luis paints every day and Maria is supposed to practice the piano. She does not play the piano enough because she prefers to go out with her friends. As for the art and music, the important part is to practice. Luis paints every day but Maria NEG...’

CHHJ7:  *pero María no toca piano a diario no*

‘but Maria does not play piano daily NEG’

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

(26)  *Rossana se va a vivir sola el próximo año pero aun no sabe cocinar. Entonces cada semana su mamá le enseña a preparar cosas nuevas. Sin embargo, Rossana nunca puede*
recordar los ingredientes. La mamá siempre le dice a Rossana que tiene que anotar todo en su libreta, pero Rossana no...

‘Rossana will be living alone next year but she still does not know how to cook. Every week her mother teaches her new recipes. However, Rossana can never remember the ingredients. Her mother always tells Rossana to write it down but Rossana NEG…’

CHHJ7: pero Rossana no lo anota no

‘but Rossana does NEG write it down NEG’

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

Gabriel odia los hongos. No los puede comer con absolutamente nada. Un día su novia le preparó una cena que tenía hongos. Entonces él se enojó y le dice “Yo no los quiero....”

‘Gabriel hates mushrooms. He cannot eat them with absolutely anything. One day his girlfriend prepared him dinner, which had mushrooms in it. So he got mad and told her: “I do not want them...”

CHHJ2: yo no los quiero, no me gustan no

‘I do not want them, I do NEG like them NEG’.

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

The participant (CHHJ2) does not use final no after quiero ‘want’, but he uses it sentence-finally with another verb gustar ‘like’, reinforcing the idea of negation and favouring ND. In this case, the first clause is the first negative mention with the explicit SN, which is immediately followed by the second negative mention.

The next examples (28-31) show the use of ND in context in which it was not expected to occur, based on Hypothesis IIId. The participant in (28) uses ND, even though there is no explicit previous use of SN.
There are three cleaning rags on the table. Luisa had been cleaning the whole day but she got frustrated because only one rag cleans well without leaving any stains. In terms of cleaning well, one rag cleans perfectly well but the other two do not…

**CHHJ7: pero los otros dos no limpian no**

‘but the other two do not clean’

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

Also, it is important to mention that the participant in (28) uses the same verb in ND as in the previous clause, which is against the initial Hypothesis IIc. Moreover, the use of ND following the affirmative clause (limpia ..bien) suggests that ND might be a marker of contrastive focus.

Next week is Lorena’s birthday. Everyone was invited. However, Juan went to Europe and Jorge is sick. In terms of the celebration, everyone is going to Lorena’s party, but Juan and Jorge do not…

**CHHJ2: pero Juan y Jorge no van a la fiesta no**

‘but Juan and Jorge will not come to the party’

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

The example in (29), similar to example (28) is not a case with explicit first negative mention, so the use of ND was not expected. The production of ND in (29) could be explained by the inclusion of sin embargo ‘however’ or ‘nevertheless’, which could be treated as some sort of explicit negation or possibly as a first negative mention. Since this project does not focus on
connectors or adverbs, which carry contrastive or negative connotation, this merits future research.

The last example (30), where ND was not predicted to occur based on the Hypothesis IId about negative mention, was produced by two participants (CHHJ5 and CHFV7).

(30) Sara y Nelson van a la agencia de viajes a preguntar por su próximo viaje. Sara quiere

ir a Europa, pero Nelson no...

‘Sara and Nelson go to the travel agency to inquire about their upcoming trip. Sara wants
to go to Europe, but Nelson NEG…’

CHFV7: pero Nelson no quiere ir a Italia, pues no quiere ir a Europa no

‘but Nelson does not want to go to Italy, well he does NEG want to go to Europe

NEG’

Chipileño female, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 35-70

CHHJ5: pero Nelson no quiere ir no

‘but Nelson does NEG want to go NEG’

Chipileño male, whose parents are both Chipileños, aged 18-34

It is important, however, to compare the two responses in (30). The first participant (CHFV7) produces her response by adding an explicit SN followed by ND. In other words, she “activates” first negative mention, which triggers the second negative mention. In this case, the use of ND is expected and supports Hypothesis IId.

As for the participant CHHJ5, the use of ND is similar to that in example (28), where the participant uses ND as the marker of contrastive focus, since the previous clause is affirmative. Similarly to (28), the second participant (CHHJ5) in (30) uses the same verb as in the first clause.

In sum, this task provided very few tokens of ND. Again, SN is the preferred variant among all the participants. In the speech of the participants with variant behaviour, four cases with ND occurred with second negative mention, or incorporation of an additional negative sentence to
reinforce the negation. The other cases with ND seem to have occurred due to contrastive focus. However due to a limited set of data, it is important to study this proposal further. The low frequency of ND in the data obtained from this task justified the need for more controlled methodology, such as the Sentence Repetition Task, discussed next.

4.5 Sentence Repetition Task

The last task that participants performed was the Sentence Repetition Task, where the participants heard a robotic voice produce a string of words. Participants were invited to repeat the utterance using their normal intonation. 112 participants took part in this task. 80 people categorically produced a standard variant. All 33 monolingual Mexican speakers only produced the SN variant. 32 bilingual participants produced a mixed set of ND and SN. Table 4.9 shows the distribution among the 32 speakers showing variability. This accounts for a total of 514 tokens out of 1422 cases (18 contexts x 79 bilingual participants) – the other tokens were produced by speakers with an invariant pattern, i.e., SN only use.

Table 4.9 shows that a standard variant is used 57% of the time, among speakers who alternate, which weakly supports Hypothesis I, i.e., the prediction that the standard negation (either absence of the final no or its use as a tag question) would be predominantly used. Yet, the difference between the rate of selection of the two variants is relatively small in this task, compared to the others.

Table 4.10 shows the distribution of ND and the results of the statistical analysis with respect to each variant of the independent variables. This table includes only the data for speakers with variable behaviour.
Table 4.10. Best model multivariate analysis of the contribution of external and internal factors selected as significant to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in the Sentence Repetition task; factor groups not selected as significant in square brackets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected mean</th>
<th>.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-342.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño both parents (CH)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño mother (CHM)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Group (18-34)</td>
<td>[.54]</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Group (35-70)</td>
<td>[.46]</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous adjacent constituent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>[.55]</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>[.57]</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>[.44]</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Pronoun</td>
<td>[.47]</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Determiner Phrase</td>
<td>[.43]</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of NEG-word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[.51]</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie in the preverbal position</td>
<td>[.51]</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie in the postverbal position</td>
<td>[.54]</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún in the preverbal position</td>
<td>[.42]</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún in the postverbal position</td>
<td>[.52]</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to a one-way multivariable analysis (logistic regression with negation type as the dependent variable and ND as the application value), two variables, i.e., parents’ ethnicity and participant’s sex, have a significant effect, as seen in Table 4.10. Age group, previous adjacent constituent, and presence of other NEG-words were also tested in the model but found to have no significant effect on the dependent variable.

The same two social factors, parents’ ethnicity and participant’s sex, had significant effects, as in the Forced Choice Preference Task, (see Tables 4.3 and 4.10), and, again, no linguistic factors had an effect on the group of speakers as a whole. I then compared subgroups, males vs. females and CH vs. CHM. vs. CHP, to see whether similar conclusions could be drawn according to the subgroup division, as I did for the Forced Choice Preference Task. Since Sex showed a significant effect in Table 4.10, I ran an additional test to see whether in addition to the rate
differences, there will be a difference in factor effects. Specifically, since males showed higher preference for ND in Table 4.10, I tested to see whether there would be any factors, which would contribute significantly to the realization of ND among males but not females (or with a different direction of effect between the two sexes). If results show significant differences in effects of linguistic factors for males but not for females, we can conclude that males and females behave differently when producing ND, in terms of conditioning effect as well as rates. It could show, for example, that the males have a more complex set of rules for determining when to use ND vs. SN. This provides an additional way to test the Labovian (2001) perspective regarding the existence of distinctions among male and female speakers.

Table 4.11 shows the comparison between males and females. According to this pair of multivariate analyses (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value), parents’ ethnicity and age have significant effects on ND use for both males and females. These results between males and females show important differences though: participants with two Chipileño parents or just a Chipileño father showed the highest proportion of ND use among males, whereas participants with a Chipileño mother showed the highest proportion of ND use among females. These findings resemble the findings in Forced Choice Preference Task, where males only with two Chipileño parents and a Chipileño father showed preference for ND use. We see a different significant effect of parents’ ethnicity among females, which supports Hypothesis IIIc about preference for ND among female participants with a Chipileño mother.

The age factor is also significant for both sexes, but with opposite effect. The distribution for the females supports Hypothesis IIIId about a higher production of ND among older speakers. However, when we analyse males alone, significantly more younger male speakers produced ND, which goes against Hypothesis IIIId. In other words, when comparing males to females, we find the reversed effect for both parent’s ethnicity and age among two sex groups. Similar to the previous analysis for Forced Choice Preference Task, ND seems to be a phenomenon of change a progress among young males, who produce the vernacular variant more than females. With regard to data on females, the preference of the ND among older females could possibly be due to the life stage changing or age grading. As Eckert (2017) claims, the speech of the older group becomes more relaxing after a certain age (p.165). Given that most of older females stay in
Chipilo, their use of Spanish becomes minimal in contrast to the younger female group who works or studies outside of the community.

Table 4.11. Best model multivariate analysis of the contribution of external and internal factors selected as significant to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in the Sentence Repetition Task; factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets. Each analysis is showed per corresponding sex group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected mean</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-206.767</td>
<td>-125.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ ethnicity</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño both parents (CH)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83/135</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44/134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51/136</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño mother (CHM)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8/28</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger Group (18-34)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100/184</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32/104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Group (35-70)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42/115</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45/111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of NEG-word</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[.50]</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49/99</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie in the postverbal position</td>
<td>[.46]</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22/49</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie in the preverbal position</td>
<td>[.55]</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31/55</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún in the postverbal position</td>
<td>[.44]</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16/44</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún in the preverbal position</td>
<td>[.55]</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24/52</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous adjacent constituent</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>% ND</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>[.54]</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50/98</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29/68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>[.56]</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30/54</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>[.45]</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27/63</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11/46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Pronoun</td>
<td>[.57]</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17/35</td>
<td>[.35]</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Determiner Phrase</td>
<td>[.37]</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18/49</td>
<td>[.46]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13/37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the linguistic factors, the presence of other negative words also had a significant effect among females only. More specifically absence of other negators and nadie ‘nobody’, favoured the use of ND, which partially supports Hypothesis II about interaction of ND with other negative elements. These data show that the two gender groups behave distinctively with regard to the variable pattern: the effect of different independent factors conditions the production of ND differently among these two groups.
Since we saw the opposite results between males and females with regard to age, I ran an additional test to see whether there was a direct interaction between these two factors, when combined. In order to do so, I collapsed sex and age factors (e.g., young male, old male, young female, old female) to see whether there is still a significant effect of these social factors on elicitation of ND.

Table 4.12 compares the three ethnic groups to see whether they behave similarly in showing significant effect of other factors.

Table 4. 12. Best model multivariate analyses of the contribution of external and internal factors selected as significant to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in the Sentence Repetition Task; factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets. Each analysis is for one ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>CHM</th>
<th>CHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-181.758</td>
<td>- 27.133</td>
<td>-132.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW % ND N/Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Sex</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83/135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Sex</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44/134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Range</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of NEG-word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie in the preverbal position</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie in the postverbal position</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún in the preverbal position</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningún in the postverbal position</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous adjacent constituent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21/57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Pronoun</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Determiner Phrase</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18/45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these multivariate analyses (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value, separate analysis for each ethnic group), participant sex has a significant effect among two of the three ethnic groups: participants with
Chipileño parents and participants with only a Chipileño mother. For both of these groups, significantly more males than females opted for the option with ND, contrary to the prediction of higher production of ND among females. The presence of other negative words showed a significant effect only for participants with two Chipileño parents. The results partially support the initial Hypothesis: ND was favoured in the contexts with no other negators. However, *nadie* ‘nobody’ in the preverbal position also had a favouring effect on ND, for just the group with two Chipileño parents. Therefore, seeing the effect of other negators for one ethnic group only can suggest that participants whose parents are Chipileños behave differently, in terms of conditioning effects as well as rate, from the other two groups, since we see the effect of the linguistic factor on the distribution of ND among this group only.

Since age was significant, as seen in Table 4.11, I next compare the distribution of ND, in each age group to see whether they behave in a similar way according to other factors (see Table 4.13). The column labelled the younger group (18-34) shows the distribution among 18 speakers with a total of 288 tokens. The column labelled the older group (35-70) shows the distribution among 14 speakers with a total of 226 tokens.

According to these multivariate analyses (logistic regression with negation type as the binary dependent variable and ND as the application value, separate analysis for each age group), parents’ ethnicity and participant sex have a significant effect on ND use for the younger group. For the younger group, participants whose parents are both Chipileños or whose mother alone is Chipileño showed the highest proportion of ND use, which, unlike the results from the other tasks, support Hypothesis IIIb. With respect to the sex factor, significantly more males than females used ND, which, again, does not support Hypothesis IIIc. Once again, none of the linguistic factors had a significant effect on ND elicitation, for the younger age group.
Table 4.13. Two best model multivariate analyses of the contribution of external and internal factors selected as significant to the probability of negative doubling (ND) in the **Sentence Repetition Task**; factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets. (Separate analyses for younger and older groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Younger group (18-34)</th>
<th>Older group (35-70)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected mean</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-184.276</td>
<td>-142.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño both parents (CH)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño mother (CHM)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of negative word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Nadie</em> in the preverbal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nadie</em> in the postverbal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ningún</em> in the preverbal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ningún</em> in the postverbal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous adjacent constituent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Determiner Phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the older age group (35-70), parents’ ethnicity and presence of other negative words have a significant effect on ND use. Participants whose parents are either both Chipileños or whose father is Chipileño showed the highest proportion of ND, which partially supports Hypothesis IIIb. Participants whose mother is Chipileño showed significant favouring effect for the younger age group, but a disfavouring effect for the older age group. As for the presence of other negative words, *nadie* ‘nobody’ in the preverbal position has a favouring effect on the elicitation of the ND use, as for example in (31).
Nobody gets up late NEG

Taking these results together, we can see that the age groups again behave differently. Specifically, not only do the older group favour the use of ND, but we also see a significant effect of a linguistic factor among this group only, as opposed to the young group, which show no significant effect with any of the linguistic factors. This suggests that age factor has a significant effect on distribution of ND.

In sum, SN is the preferred option in the Sentence Repetition Task (n=295, 57%); however, the ND variant occurred 43% of the time among speakers who showed variation between SN and ND. These results support Hypothesis I about distributional differences across four tasks, with ND occurring the most frequently in the least contextual task, e.g., the Sentence Repetition Task. With regard to social factors, parents’ ethnicity was significant: more participants with Chipileño parents and a Chipileño father used ND. Also, significantly more males than females favoured ND among the younger group and among the participants with Chipileño parents or a Chipileño mother. Also, the results showed significant effect of one of the linguistic factors (nadie ‘nobody’) among the older group only. Furthermore, the findings revealed a significant interaction between age and sex, such that young males and old females favour ND. In other words, the data showed differences between sex and age groups. Younger females, as opposed to young males and older females, disfavoured the ND variant, which suggest that they prefer to use a standard variant. On the other hand, young males consistently favoured the use of ND. Therefore, similar to the results from the Forced Choice Preference Task, there is a clear indication of male speakers’ preference of a non-standard variant. These results are consistent with the Labovian claim of gender differences, which states that males use a higher frequency of nonstandard forms than females (p. 205), in cases of stable variation. With regard to the age factor, even though the results were not significant for the ND rate, age had a significant effect in interaction with sex. As previous discussion showed, given the preference of ND among younger males, we can hypothesize that ND is a change in progress, since this group, as opposed to others, had a higher preference for a vernacular variant. ND could also be a phenomenon of
age grading, based on the data of the older females, who showed significant differences in comparison to the younger females.

Social factors played a stronger role on the distribution of the phenomenon than did the linguistic factors, exhibiting a more consistent effect across the four tasks. The next section provides an overview of the responses across all four tasks, according to three social factors.

4.6 Overview of social factors and task effect in the elicitation of ND

This section provides an overview of all bilingual participants with variant and invariant behaviour, according to all social factors in all four tasks, in order to see whether the task played a role in ND elicitation and participants’ preference for its use. First, the distributional analysis of the participants in numbers and percentages based on social factors per each task is shown in Table 4.14, followed by a multivariate analysis of social factors (Table 4.15) and task effect (Table 4.16).

Table 4.14 shows a summary of all 79 participants, those with variant and invariant behaviour, across the four tasks, grouped by three social variables. A different number and percentage of participants in each task in a total row is due to a different number of participants who opted for both SN and ND variants within the same task. The criteria for classifying participants in their preference and production of either SN or ND were homogenous across four tasks. In other words, if participants did not use final *no* with a falling contour, but rather a tag or preverbal *no* only, they were part of the participants with invariant behaviour (SN). However, if the participants used a mixed set of both variants, they were included into a count of participants with variant behaviour (SN+ND).
Table 4.14. Number and percentage of the bilingual participants’ responses according to three social factors in four tasks (n=79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elicited conversation speech</th>
<th>Forced Choice Preference Task</th>
<th>Sentence Completion Task</th>
<th>Sentence Repetition Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN only</td>
<td>SN+ND</td>
<td>SN only</td>
<td>SN+ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH (n=39)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM (n=20)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP (n=20)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=39)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=40)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger (n=37)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older (n=42)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold coloured numbers indicate the number and percentage of participants in each subgroup producing two variants, in comparison to the other subgroup(s) of the same category. The numbers are bolded and coloured in order to show which subgroup has a higher number of participants using both variants (SN+ND).
As seen in Table 4.14, SN is the preferred option in all four tasks; however, the distribution of the participants is different in each of them. Similar to previous analyses of speakers with variant behaviour only, a higher percentage of all bilingual participants used ND in the Sentence Repetition Task and the Forced Choice Preference Task, while there are lower percentages of ND in the Sentence Completion Task and Elicited conversational speech. More specifically, the Sentence Repetition Task is the only task where we see that there is not much difference in the number of speakers who varied vs. those who used SN only. When comparing the effects of the social factors across the four tasks, we find similarities. Regarding parents’ ethnicity, in all four tasks, participants with two Chipileño parents produced a higher rate of ND and SN. The other two ethnic groups did not show consistent differences in their production of two variants. With regard to the sex variable, more males than females produced a mixed set of ND and SN across three tasks (36% of the participants (n=14) in the Forced Choice Preference Task; 8% of the participants (n=3) in the Sentence Completion Task; and 49% of the participants (n=19) in the Sentence Repetition Task). As for the age factor, again in three tasks, a higher number of younger speakers produced a mixed set of variants (41% (n=15) in the Forced Choice Preference Task; 8% (n=3) in the Sentence Completion Task; and 49% (n=18) in the Sentence Repetition task). In contrast, only older participants produced a mixed set of ND and SN during the elicited conversation task.

Overall, bilingual participants showed similar patterns (e.g., preference for ND use among males, young speakers, and participants with two Chipileño parents), according to all three social factors in four tasks. In order to see which social factors have a significant effect on the distribution of speakers who used ND in four tasks, I ran a multivariate analysis, shown in Table 4.15. In this case, unlike all the previous analyses, the dependent variable was the behaviour of each participant, categorized as variable (SN+ND) vs. invariable (always SN), and the application value was participant with a variable behaviour. Table 4.15 reports on 79 bilingual speakers with variant and invariant behaviour, which accounts for a total of 316 tokens (79 speakers x 4 tasks), showing which social factors significantly predict variability across the four tasks.
Table 4.15. Best model multivariate analysis of the effect of external factors selected as significant to the probability of negative doubling (ND) among 79 bilingual participants in all tasks combined; factor groups not selected as significant are in square brackets.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected mean</th>
<th>0.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-154.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N of participants</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39/152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25/164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Group</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38/148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18-34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Group</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26/168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35-70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño both parents (CH)</td>
<td>[.53]</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33/156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño mother (CHM)</td>
<td>[.43]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>[.52]</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18/76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the best model multivariate analysis (logistic regression with participant variability as the dependent variable and as the application value), participant’s sex and age have a significant effect on ND use across the four tasks. Significantly more males than females used ND. With regard to age, younger speakers produced a significantly higher number of ND variants. These results are somewhat similar to the ones obtained in the Forced Choice Preference and the Sentence Repetition Tasks, since significantly more younger males than females showed preference for ND use. Again, these results show that sex groups and age groups behave differently. It also shows that in the data from the four tasks combined, the effect of parents’ ethnicity is non-significant.

Since in Table 4.14, we saw more participants used a mixed set of SN and ND in two controlled tasks, it is important to see whether ND distribution is related to the nature of the task (e.g., spontaneous vs. controlled, contextualized vs. isolated) or to the individuals, in order to understand if ND is a bilingual group characteristic or an individual characteristic. To do that, I ran a monovariate analysis of the effect of task, coded as an independent factor on 79 participants in each task (79 participants x 4 tasks), with a total of 316 tokens). The dependent

---

28 Given that each task analyzed different internal factors, I only include external factors for the analysis.
variable was participant variability, and the application value was the participant with variant behaviour.

Table 4.16. Best model monovariate analysis of the effect of each task selected as significant to the probability of participant responses to opt for ND and SN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected mean</th>
<th>Log likelihood</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-133.495</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Repetition</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Choice Preference</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicited Speech</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Completion</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4.16, task effect has a significant effect for eliciting ND. More specifically, the Sentence Repetition and Forced Choice Preference Tasks triggered the highest number of ND tokens. Moreover, as seen from Table 4.16, 41% speakers (n=32) and 30% speakers (n=24) produced a mixed set of two variants in the Sentence Repetition Task and the Forced Choice Preference Task, respectively, in comparison to only four speakers who used some ND in the Interviews and in the Sentence Completion Task, the two tasks that were somewhat more spontaneous than the other two. These results suggest that the participants favoured the use of ND in the two controlled tasks only.

### 4.7 Individual results of ND use

The next step is to analyze the individual data of just the speakers who produced a mixed set of ND and SN, in order to see whether ND is used more due to the nature of a specific task or rather among individuals who produced ND at the highest rate. The results will determine whether the production of ND is dependent on the task or is part of the individual repertoire. To do so, I first provide individual results for all the speakers with variable behaviour, followed by individual analysis of four speakers who used ND extensively. Table 4.17 shows the individual results of the participants who used both ND and SN.
Table 4.17: Individual results of ND use across four tasks (Check marks refer to ND use; highlighting stresses the participants who used ND in at least three tasks)\textsuperscript{29}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Task 1 Interviews</th>
<th>Task 2 The Forced Choice Preference Task</th>
<th>Task 3 The Sentence Completion Task</th>
<th>Task 4 The Sentence Repetition Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHH21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHH24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHV6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFJ2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFJ3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFJ4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFV4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFV7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMHJ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMHJ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMHJ3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMHJ4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMH21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMHV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMFJ4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMFV2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPH22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPHJ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPHJ3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPHJ4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPHJ5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPHJ6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPHJ7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPFJ1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPFJ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPF21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPF23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-eight speakers produced both ND and SN in one or more of the four tasks. Most of the participants produced ND in the Forced Choice Preference Task (Task 2) and the Sentence Completion Task (Task 3).

\textsuperscript{29} See Appendix G for all the sentences with ND use.
Repetition Task (Task 4), which seems that ND production is dependent on the task. Moreover, Table 4.17 clarifies several patterns. First, based on the table, we can see that participants who used ND in Task 3 also used it in Task 2 and Task 4; in other words, these participants used the phenomenon in the three controlled tasks. On the other hand, there is no implicational relationship between using ND in Task 1 and the other tasks: two participants (CHMFV2 and CHPH22) used it in the elicited speech but not in any of the controlled tasks. This can mean that these speakers transfer and use ND sometimes in the spontaneous setting, but their use of ND might be restricted to a specific negative context only.

Second, Table 4.17 and Appendix G clearly show the extensive use of ND among four participants. Only a single speaker (CHFV7), a Chipileño female (aged 35-70) whose parents are both Chipileños, produced cases of ND across all four tasks. Three participants (CHHJ2, CHHJ5, CHHJ7), all male participants aged 18-34 whose parents are both Chipileño, used ND across three tasks. In other words, ND does not seem to be a variant used by all members of the community equally, so it is possible to assume that the use of ND could also be dependent on the individual. It is important to note that the three young male speakers belong to different social networks; speakers CHFV7 and CHHJ2 are relatives, but do not reside at the same house. I discuss these four individuals’ behaviours below.
Table 4.18. Frequency of SN and ND distribution (in numbers and percentages) among the four participants who use ND in three or four tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>CHHJ2</th>
<th></th>
<th>CHHJ5</th>
<th></th>
<th>CHHJ7</th>
<th></th>
<th>CHFV7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicited Speech</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Choice Preference Task</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Completion Task</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Repetition Task</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers are coloured in order to show which task has a higher number of ND.
Table 4.18 shows the distribution of negators among these four speakers in each task. Numbers for SN and ND refer to the number of negative scenarios in each task. As recalled from the Methodology Chapter, the Forced Choice Preference Task has a total of 11 scenarios, the Sentence Completion Task has a total of 9 scenarios, and the Sentence Repetition Task has a total of 18 target scenarios.

As seen in Table 4.18, two male participants (CHHJ2, CHHJ5) predominantly used ND in the Sentence Repetition Task, as opposed to the other two controlled tasks. In the Sentence Repetition Task, the first speaker (CHHJ2) uses ND in 16 cases out of a possible 18, so his use of ND in this task is not restricted to or favoured by a specific utterance.\(^{30}\) In the Forced Choice Preference Task, CHHJ2 produces ND in nine out of 11 possible utterances. He uses ND with other negative words, such as nadie ‘nobody’ and tampoco ‘neither’. With regard to the previous context, this participant uses ND with both first and second negative mention, so no specific conclusion can be drawn about pragmatic motivations for his ND use. In the Sentence Completion Task, the first use of ND is favoured by the use of the preceding negation; in other words, it occurs as a second negative mention. However, the second instance occurs with the first negative mention. In summary, it seems that for CHHJ2, ND is used in free variation with SN.

\(^{30}\) Two of the utterances he produced had a flat intonation and therefore were excluded.
The second speaker, CHHJ5, uses ND four times in the Forced Choice Preference Task, out of a possible 11. Three of these cases are in the context of a second negative mention. In the Sentence Completion Task, the use of ND is also correlated with the second negative mention, where the speaker repeats the initial negative sentence. In the Sentence Repetition Task, the participant predominantly uses ND (14 cases out of 18), independently of the previous adjacent constituent. In summary, CHHJ5 seems to use ND more with second negative mention, independently of the presence of other negators or adjacent elements.

The third speaker, CHHJ7, uses ND six times in the Forced Choice Preference Task. This speaker however, does not use ND with other negative words in this task. Three cases of ND use, out of four, are favoured in the context with the second negative mention. As for the Sentence Completion Task, the speaker uses three cases with ND with second negative mention in the scenario. With regard to the last task, the speaker uses ND when the negative word is in the preverbal position only. However, there is not a specific previous constituent that favours ND, i.e., ND occurs with verbs, adverbs, and nouns as previous constituents. It is also important to mention that even though the speaker does not use ND in Elicited Speech, he recognizes ND to be one of the markers of bilingual speech. To summarize the results for this speaker, the use of ND is mostly limited to second negative mention and other negative words in the preverbal position.

In contrast to the above three male speakers who produced an extensive number of ND tokens, the older female speaker (CHFV7) produces only one instance with ND in the Sentence Repetition Task, as shown in (32).

(32) CHFV7: No trabaja nadie no

NEG works nobody NEG

‘Nobody works.’

One of the possible explanations of her sole use of ND in the Repetition Task is that she misunderstood the task. Overall during the Sentence Repetition Task, she produced a mix of non-falling, plain contour, and tag questions, which suggests that she might not have understood what she specifically had to do. In the other three tasks, her three uses of ND were favoured with
a second negative mention. Examples (33-35) produced by the same participant show the use of ND in the other three tasks.

(33) CHFV7...Hay personas, que como que critican como que no les gusta no.  

   Nos llaman extranjeros.  

   ‘There are people who like criticize like they do not like it [hearing Veneto] NEG. They call us foreigners’.

   In the Elicited Speech

(34) Diego trabaja en una oficina donde existe una norma formal y profesional de vestirse. Sin embargo, Diego siempre usa sus tenis en vez de usar unos zapatos de vestir. Varias veces le regañó su jefe y le pidió que comprara unos zapatos.  

   ‘Diego works in the office where a formal and professional dress code is necessary. However, Diego always wear his tennis shoes instead of wearing his dress shoes. Many times, his boss reprimanded Diego and told him to buy dress shoes’.

   ¿Le gusta al jefe como se viste Diego?  

   him like to the boss how himself dress Diego  

   ‘Does the boss like what Diego wears?’

   CHFV7: No, no le gusta no.  

   No, NEG him.like NEG  

   ‘No, he does not NEG’  

   in the Forced Choice Preference Task

(35) CHFV7: Pero Nelson no quiere ir a Italia, pues no quiere ir a Europa no  

   ‘But Nelson does not want to go to Italy, well he doesn’t want to go to Europe

   NEG’  

   in the Sentence Completion Task
Therefore, CHFV7’s use of ND seems to be favoured with a second negative mention across three tasks. However, in comparison to other participants, she used ND four times only, opting for the SN variant in most of the instances. Thus, this might suggest her overall resemblance to the speakers who did not vary.

Based on data from the observed four individual results, the ND in the speech of the above four speakers seems to be unique to their own repertoire of speech. This observation is also consistent with the results from the sociolinguistic questionnaires, which examined the use of Veneto in three different settings, as seen in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19. Participant’s use of Veneto at home, work and with friends in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-reported likelihood of use of Veneto</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Home</td>
<td>at Work</td>
<td>with Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFV7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the self-reports summarized in Table 4.19, all speakers use mostly Veneto at home, whereas both Spanish and Veneto are used when interacting with friends. With regard to work, only CHHJ2 uses exclusively Veneto at work, whereas the other three participants use both languages. The data from the sociolinguistic questionnaires indicate that CHHJ2 works inside Chipilo as a farmer. CHHJ5 works in Chipilo in a local family restaurant, so interactions happen in both languages depending on the interlocutor. CHHJ7 is a veterinarian who works both inside and outside of the community, so he uses both Spanish and Veneto. Finally, CHFV7 is a merchant who sells agricultural goods for locals and nonlocals, which means that she also uses both languages. Thus, based on the different lifestyles reported in their sociolinguistic questionnaires, it is possible to conclude that their speech is shaped by the professional network circles, as well as the occupation they each have.

Moreover, an interesting trend among these four speakers under discussion emerged from the results of the elicited conversational speech. Two questions in the interview involved the attitudes of monolingual speakers towards Chipileños and whether Chipileños speak differently than the monolingual group. Only CHHJ2 claimed that he wanted to speak as a monolingual speaker, as seen in (36):
(36) I: ¿Y te gustaría hablar como un mexicano monolingüe?

‘Would you like to speak as a monolingual Mexican?’

CHHJ2: ¡A veces sí! Porque dicen que tengo un acento feo o a veces me dicen que soy extranjero o que no hablo bien el español o cosas así

‘Sometimes, I do! Because they [monolingual speakers] say that I have an ugly accent and sometimes, they say I am a foreigner and that I do not speak Spanish well, or things like that’.

According to (36), the speaker may feel some sort of discrimination or discomfort, which might reflect on his speech in Spanish. Yet, the data shows that he used ND extensively. Also, it is important to mention that he was one of the participants who recognized ND as a marker of bilingual speech. Since he explicitly mentioned ND in the Elicited Speech Task, it is possible to assume that he was more conscious of his speech during the Elicited Speech Task and was speaking more formally due to his awareness of sounding ‘foreign’. In contrast to this speaker, the other three speakers stated that they did not want to speak like monolingual speakers, although one of them (CHHJ5) claimed that he spoke like one.

To sum up, 38 speakers out of 79 bilingual Chipileños used ND in one or more tasks. Moreover, four speakers showed a high percentage of ND across two of the three controlled tasks, especially in the Sentence Repetition Task. In the Forced Choice Preference Task, their results show that ND is favoured mostly in the contexts with second negative mention. No tendency, however, can be concluded from performance in the other two tasks. In other words, based on both the group and individual data of the participants who showed a variable behaviour, we can conclude that ND is both an individually-driven and a task-related phenomenon. The majority of speakers who showed variable behaviour used ND predominantly in two controlled tasks, which supports the task-related initial prediction. Unlike many speakers, CHFV7 showed a different trend towards ND use, which suggests that ND can be also an individually-distributed phenomenon.
4.8 Summary of the results

This chapter provided the results of four tasks, showing the distribution of ND vs. SN according to linguistic, social and task factors as well as singling out some individuals’ behaviours. The results show that SN is the preferred variant among all speakers in Chipilo. Moreover, all 34 monolingual speakers of Spanish only produced cases with SN, whereas 38 out of 79 bilingual speakers showed a mixed set of ND and SN use. ND use varied across the tasks. Two tasks, the Forced Choice Preference and the Sentence Repetition Tasks, produced a higher rate of ND use (76 of 217 tokens and 295 of 514 tokens, respectively) among the participants with variable behaviour. The least contextualizing task, i.e., the Sentence Repetition Task, provided the highest number of ND tokens. In contrast, the Elicited Conversational Speech and the Sentence Completion Task revealed few tokens of ND use.

With regard to the linguistic factors, the effect of them was not a strong or consistent indicator in elicitation of ND, in spite of a combination of the spontaneous speech and experimental tasks. Second negative mention, however, was a significant factor in favouring the use of ND in the Forced Choice Preference Task, specifically among younger speakers and males with two Chipileño parents and Chipileño father only, suggesting that these two groups behave differently from the other groups (females, older speakers, participants with a Chipileño mother). More specifically, we find evidence of differences between sex groups, since the data shows significant effect of sex factor, specifically a favouring effect of ND distribution among males only. The higher rate of ND use among males can be interpreted as their preference of the vernacular variant, as suggested by Labov’s Principle I (1991). The younger females, on the other hand, show disfavouring effect of ND use and their preference of the standard variant, SN, which again supports Labovian’s claim of gender differences. With regard to the age factor, the results suggest that ND may be a phenomenon of change in progress, based on the Forced Choice Preference and the Repetition Tasks, since the younger group only showed a significant effect of second negative mention in the Forced Choice Preference Task. ND could also be a phenomenon of age grading, since the results showed a significant effect of other negators (e.g., Nadie ‘nobody’ in the postverbal position) among older females only. Again, this data indicates
that sex and age groups behave differently according to the task. Detailed interpretation of the results is found in the next chapter.
Chapter 5
Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 General summary

This chapter discusses the results presented in Chapter 4 in light of the research questions and hypotheses posed in Chapters 1 and 2. Three research questions guided this dissertation, which focused on identifying the distribution of ND in Chipileño Spanish, as well as determining the linguistic and social factors that affected the occurrence of ND. Based on these results, I was able to answer the major question of the dissertation, as posed in Chapter 1:

(1) What factors determine/condition a language feature to be retained and transferred in a bilingual setting context?

Overall, social factors, specifically sex and parents’ ethnicity, had a strong effect. The results did not show strong support for the effect of linguistic factors, contrary to predictions. Only second negative mention showed a favouring effect among young, male, bilingual speakers. In other words, overall, the results show more significant correlation between social factors and ND than between linguistic factors and ND.

The next sections discuss the results and their relevance to previous studies in more detail. Section 5.2.1 centres on the frequency of ND, while Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 focus on the linguistic and social constraints of ND use. Section 5.3 discusses the effects of participant attitude on the study. Section 5.4 presents the implications for the field of language contact and transfer in light of the findings of this dissertation. Finally, this chapter concludes in section 5.5 with directions for further research.
5.2 Evaluations of the three hypotheses and connection with previous literature

5.2.1 Frequency of Negative Doubling in previous work and present project across different tasks

One of the first aims of this study was to identify the presence and frequency of ND (2), in Chipileño Spanish, in comparison to SN, as in (1):

(1)   El  no  va (¿no?)
     I    NEG goes

     ‘He does not go, (right?)’

(2)   El  no  va  no
     He   NEG goes  NEG

     ‘He does not go’

I predicted that SN would be the preferred variant in Chipileño Spanish, but the occurrence would vary according to the task. I hypothesized that participants would produce ND more frequently in the controlled tasks, specifically in the Sentence Repetition Task.

This section first discusses the results of ND rate presented in Chapter 4 and compares the findings with brief reports on ND in Chipilo (Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2014), as well as other Romance varieties (Cuervo & Mazzaro, 2013; Schwenter, 2005, 2006; Sousa, 2007, Teixeira de Sousa, 2011). Previous findings (Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2014) on Chipileño Spanish showed discrepancy in ND rate. Barnes (2009) claims that ND is often used among bilingual speakers. She provides data from an online listserv, as well as sociolinguistic interviews in which Barnes (2009) displays a few instances of ND that occurred in contexts of emphasis or contrast. Unlike Barnes, my preliminary findings (Tararova, 2014), taken from my 2012 corpus of sociolinguistic interviews, showed very few instances (n=4 in a total of 20 interviews ranging between 30 minutes to an hour) of ND in Chipileño Spanish.

Similar to my observations, other researchers (Cuervo & Mazzaro, 2013; Schwenter, 2005; Sousa, 2007) found infrequent use of ND in two other Romance varieties, Brazilian Portuguese...
and the Argentinian Spanish of Corrientes. The results from their analyzed spontaneous speech corpus showed infrequent use of ND in Brazilian Portuguese, 14%, 17 out of a total of 931 negative tokens, in comparison to the SN variant (84%, 785/931) (Sousa, 2007). Schwenter (2005) also claimed that ND in Brazilian Portuguese occurs rarely in spontaneous speech. The Argentinian Spanish variety of Corrientes (CS), a variety in contact with the other official language of the region, Guaraní, also exhibits cases of ND. The ND in CS, however, is different in comparison to ND in Chipileño Spanish or Brazilian Portuguese, due to the position of no, as well as the overall structure, as in (3).

(3) *Nadie no vino*

Nobody NEG came

‘Nobody came’

As seen in (3), ND in CS consists of the co-occurrence of a preverbal negative word with preverbal *no*, as opposed to standard Spanish which omits the negator *no* in case there is a preverbal negative word (*Nadie* ‘Nobody’). Yet, even though ND in CS is formed differently, ND in CS showed infrequent use, similar to Brazilian Portuguese. Based on sociolinguistic interviews, Cuervo & Mazzaro (2013) found that ND was also an infrequent phenomenon in CS, occurring at roughly 14% of the observed instances out of a total of 437 stimuli of negation. Thus, all studies agree in showing much lower rates of ND than SN.

In order to compare previous findings on ND frequency (Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2014) with the findings from the present project, I also tested ND in the semi-spontaneous speech and found only four tokens with ND (1% of all possible cases with negation). These results are consistent with my preliminary work (Tararova, 2014) and the other three studies on ND (Cuervo & Mazzaro, 2013; Schwenter, 2005; Sousa, 2007) but contradict Barnes’ (2009) findings. One interpretation of this finding is that the phenomenon of ND is not common in spoken speech. Another possibility is that the task itself might have included few contexts in which ND is pragmatically appropriate. It is possible that ND is constrained to certain contexts, and its prevalence is thus so low that it may not be easily captured with this highly naturalistic method. The absence of some features in the Elicited Conversational Task does not always suggest that

---

31 The other 2% (n=17) was the third type of negation, which is postverbal (V +NEG).
the phenomenon is rare; ND’s restriction to a specific context, as mentioned, is an alternative explanation.

During the Elicited Conversational Speech, a few participants mentioned the existence of the ND phenomenon and its frequent use among many bilingual speakers in both Veneto and Spanish. Given my role as a researcher, not a local Veneto speaker, it is possible that some participants may not have felt comfortable enough to speak freely about their life, taste, and other topics, and thus their spontaneous speech might not have been fully natural. This is consistent with observations made by King (2000), who claims that it is very challenging to gather and reveal the full repertoire of individual speakers, much less the entire speech community, in sociolinguistic interviews or other traditional data elicitations, if the interviewer is not local (p. 54).

Since my previous work and other studies on negation only employed one method of eliciting the phenomenon, spontaneous interviews, this dissertation also included three controlled experimental tasks in addition to elicited speech. A combination of methods allowed me to obtain a larger and more targeted sample in order to better examine the phenomenon for insight into its frequency and constraints on use. More specifically, due to a larger data set, I was successful in analyzing results quantitatively and supporting these findings with qualitative analysis. Overall, the data from the three experimental tasks showed that, as predicted in Hypothesis I, SN was the preferred variant. However, the relative distribution of SN and ND was different across these tasks. I turn now to a discussion of the task effects, in light of Hypothesis I.

Two controlled tasks, the Forced Choice Preference and Sentence Repetition Tasks, elicited higher rates of ND than did the Elicited Conversational Speech. The Forced Choice Preference Task elicited 214 tokens out of 869 possible tokens (25%) in the speech of 21 speakers showing variability, whereas the Sentence Repetition Task elicited 514 tokens out of 1,422 possible tokens (35%) in the speech of 32 speakers who showed a mixed set of ND and SN. Thus, both in terms of number of speakers using ND and number of tokens produced, ND is more frequent in the Sentence Repetition Task than in the Forced Choice Preference Task. As reported in Chapter 3, the Sentence Repetition Task was the least contextualized task, in that it only focused on repeating the sentences using normal intonation – there was no communicative goal. Therefore, it is possible that this task showed a higher rate of ND because the participants are less
conscious of their speech when repeating after a robotic voice. Interestingly, the other two controlled tasks, which were similar in number of target scenarios and investigation of the negative mention variable, showed significantly different results. The results from the Forced Choice Preference Task suggest that participants are more conscious of the presence of ND when selecting from a number of ‘natural’ responses. Finally, even though the Sentence Completion Task was a controlled task, it elicited only 7 tokens out of a total of 335 stimuli (2%), with an exclusion of 59 tokens. Since participants were restricted to a specific scenario, we can say that ND was not favoured in the given contexts.

In summary, based on my analysis and interpretation of the data from this dissertation, ND is an infrequent phenomenon in semi-spontaneous speech, and only slightly more frequent in experimental tasks with targeted environments predicted to elicit ND. This finding supports previous literature on ND frequency, based on spontaneous interviews only. This project, however, provides more detailed analysis on ND rate, since it examined three additional tasks, which showed different distribution of the phenomenon. As such, ND occurred at a higher rate in the Sentence Repetition and Forced Choice Preference Tasks than in the Elicited Conversational Speech and Sentence Completion task. The data from the former two tasks allowed me to run a multivariate analysis in order to find the significance level of both linguistic and social factors, which I discuss next.

5.2.2 Relevance of linguistic factors in previous work and present project

My second objective for this project was to examine how linguistic factors condition the presence of ND. In this dissertation, I was also able to answer the research question in (4), posed in Chapter 1.

(4) Do any linguistic factors have a significant effect on elicitation of ND in Chipileño Spanish? If so, what linguistic factors, out of a) previous adjacent element (noun, verb, adverb, negative pronoun, and/or negative determiner phrase), b) use of other negative
words (their position (subject or object) and type (*neither*, *nobody*, *no one*)), c) type of verb, and d) negative mention in a preceding context, favour the appearance of ND in Chipilo?

I predicted that ND would be favoured in contexts with verb as previous constituent, omission of other negative words, different verb from the preceding context, and second negative mention.

Based on the results from Chapter 4, this project finds weak support for linguistic factors on the elicitation of the phenomenon. More specifically, second negative mention had a significant effect in the Forced Choice Preference Task. Other factors showed either no support or little support for ND elicitation. These results are somewhat consistent with previous observations and research.

It is important to keep in mind that the three experimental tasks manipulated different linguistic factors. The Forced Choice Preference Task controlled for three linguistic variables: negative mention (first or second) in question-pair responses, the same or different verb in the preceding context, and the presence of other negative words in the context (*nadie* ‘nobody’ and *tampoco* ‘neither’). The Sentence Completion Task tested for the effect of negative mention in the given context. Finally, the Sentence Repetition Task tested for the effect of the role of the previous adjacent element (noun, verb, adverb, negative pronoun and/or negative determiner phrase), and the presence of other negative words and their position (subject or object). Only two controlled tasks, the Forced Choice Preference and Sentence Repetition Tasks, showed significant effects from any linguistic factors. Neither of the other two tasks elicited enough tokens of ND to run a multivariate analysis. Therefore, it is possible to assume that the lack of the effect of linguistic factors in two tasks can be due low ND frequency.

The previous negative mention variable had a significant effect on ND use among the younger group in the Forced Choice Preference Task. Although the Elicited conversational speech and Sentence Completion Task did not have a large total number of tokens with ND, the results in both of these tasks also showed a tendency to use ND with a previous negative mention, compared to contexts with no previous negative mention. These findings are consistent with my previous research (Tararova, 2014), as well as the research on ND in Italy (Poletto, 2008, 2016). Poletto (2008, 2016), in her research on ND in Veneto in Italy, also claimed that ND was
favoured in contexts with a previous negative mention. Regarding Schwenter’s (2005, 2006) proposal of ND use in contexts with denial of proposition, this project showed that ND was mostly used as a marker of reinforcement of a previously negated clause (i.e., used as second negative mention), rather than as a marker of disagreement. Moreover, ND in Brazilian Portuguese is restricted to specific pragmatic contexts, specifically to denials of activated, salient discourse-old propositions, which are similar to Zanuttini’s (1997) observations of use of *miga* in Northern Italian varieties or *mica* in Standard Italian. It is interesting to mention, however, that there were three similar cases in the Sentence Completion Task, which showed the use of ND as a marker of a contrastive focus. Also, similar to Schwenter’s (2005, 2006) findings, my project did find more cases of ND after an immediately previous negated clause (SN), i.e., second negative mention.

With regard to other negative words, Hypothesis IIb predicted ND would not be favoured in contexts with other negative words. This is consistent with the present results, which showed no significant effect of other negative words on ND. However, *nadie* ‘nobody’ in the preverbal and the postverbal position had a favouring effect on ND use in the speech of older speakers and participants with Chipileño parents and female participants, respectively. One of the possible explanations of the effect of other negators and final *no* is the distance of the constituents. The results for the older speakers and the participants with Chipileño parents seem to suggest that the larger the distance between the constituents (the negative word and final *no*) the higher chance there is for ND to be produced (for older speakers and participants with two Chipileño parents). If these observations generalize, we can adopt an approach similar to that of Cuervo & Mazzaro’s (2013), who discuss distance as one of the variables favouring the duplication of the negation. Even though the negation in the Corrientes Spanish variety is different from that in Chipileño Spanish, present results show that the further the distance between the negative word in the preverbal position and the *no*, the higher the probability of a final *no* being present. Therefore, a future experiment, with more tokens per variant and similar stimuli design, one that controls for distance between the two negative elements, will help to identify and describe the effects of other negative words on ND. It will also be essential to define and analyse the other negative words. In Cuervo & Mazzaro’s (2013) study, there was a tendency for ND use in cases where the negative word had a specific reference to a known individual or set of individuals. For example, *nadie* ‘nobody’ can refer to ‘nobody in the world’ or ‘nobody from the set of people I am talking about’; the latter case favoured ND. Since the Sentence Repetition Task was a task
with isolated words and no context, it is hard to analyse the applicability of these proposals. If it is determined that it is reasonable to extend this factor to ND in Chipilo, future analysis could establish whether reference value indeed affects the distribution of the phenomenon in Chipilo.

Type of verb did not have a favouring effect in ND use, against our expectations. During the analysis of the Elicited Conversation Speech, we see three contexts with use of different verb from the preceding context, similar to my previous pilot study (Tararova, 2012). Other tasks, however, showed no effect of type of the verb. These results suggest that type of verb as a variable has no effect on ND elicitation.

Furthermore, the choice of previous adjacent constituents also had no effect on ND, against expectations and findings from other studies (e.g., Poletto, 2008, 2016). This is consistent for the most part with Barnes’ (2009) observations, which showed the prevalence of ND with verbs and nouns as previous constituents. In other words, ND was used with all adjacent previous constituents: verbs, nouns, negative determiner phrases, negative pronouns, and adverbs.

To conclude, ND in Chipileño Spanish was favoured with a second negative mention in some tasks, as initially predicted. This supports my previous observations, as well as Poletto’s (2008) work on ND in Veneto, which seems to suggest that ND in both varieties is used in similar negative contexts. Additionally, it is possible that ND has been transferred from Veneto to the Spanish of some bilingual speakers along with its pragmatic function. This prediction still merits further research because the effect of negative mention was not consistent among the bilingual speakers across the tasks.

Overall, in spite of the effect of negative mention, the findings show the lack of the effect of other linguistic factors due to ND infrequency. It is important to keep in mind that this is the first exploratory study which focused on analysing potential linguistic factors which contributed to ND production. Given the fact that the rate of ND was only significant in two controlled tasks, in the future, it will be essential to examine other linguistic factors, which could potentially affect the distribution of ND, and/or try other tasks.
5.2.3 Relevance of social factors in previous work and present project

My third objective was to test whether ND was selected at a higher frequency among specific social groups, who differed in sex, age, and parents’ ethnicity. The effect of the linguistic factors that showed significance in previous section suggests that social groups behave differently.

Previous observations on ND use in Chipilo showed that the phenomenon was used among bilingual speakers only (Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2014). Additionally, my previous report (Tararova, 2014) found the use of ND only among females and older speakers. To the best of my knowledge, none of the studies has previously investigated the use of ND among speakers with only one Chipileño parent. I was therefore interested to see if the speech behaviour of speakers of mixed background would be similar to that of monolingual speakers or speakers with two Chipileño parents, and whether it made a difference which parent was Chipileño. I hypothesized that ND would occur among bilingual speakers only. Additionally, I predicted that a higher rate of ND was expected from bilingual Chipileños and participants whose mothers only were Chipileños, while monolingual Mexicans and those participants whose fathers only were Chipileño would produce more cases of the standard variant. I also predicted that women and the older age group would produce more ND in comparison to males and younger speakers, respectively.

Using the ND token distributions produced during the Forced Choice Preference and the Sentence Repetition Tasks, I was able to answer the third research question:

(5) How do social factors (parents’ ethnicity, sex, and age) affect ND in Chipilo?

The results from the previous chapter confirmed only some hypotheses. Importantly, I was first able to confirm that none of the monolingual speakers used ND, which shows that the phenomenon is only present in the Spanish of some bilingual speakers. These results are consistent with Barnes (2009) and Tararova (2014), which elicited a few ND tokens, but only among bilingual speakers. Therefore, even though Spanish is the dominant language in Mexico, the data suggests a minority language influence from Veneto into the Spanish of the bilingual speakers. It is important to understand that Veneto has a dual role in the community. On the one hand, it is a minority language, whose domains are restricted to informal familiar settings. On
the other hand, Veneto is not inferior to Spanish since it is the language of the community, which is heard extensively on the street, at home, and at work. The results on bilingual use are consistent with the findings on Catalan Spanish bilinguals in Minorca. As described in Chapter 2, Catalan is another Romance variety which exhibits cases of ND (non ...pas). Through an experimental study of controlled laboratory speech, De Prada Pérez (2008) concluded that ND was only used among bilingual speakers of Catalan and Spanish, but not by monolingual Spanish speakers. A study on the Argentinian Spanish of Corrientes, however, shows different results from the present study. Analyzing bilingual speakers of Spanish-Guaraní and monolingual Spanish speakers, Cuervo & Mazzaro (2013) found that ND is also used in the speech of monolingual speakers, possibly due to the official status of the Guarani’s language. It is important to mention that Guarani is a co-official language in the Corrientes region and has a prestigious status in the community (Cuervo & Mazzaro, 2013). In the case of Chipilo, while Veneto is a prestigious variety within the community, only some of the monolingual respondents during the Elicited Conversation Speech mentioned that they would like to learn Veneto; the majority of monolinguals either had a neutral response or commented that they would prefer to learn standard Italian or English. Unlike the situation in Argentina where Guarani is the second official language in the region of Corrientes, Chipilo is only an oral variety and lacks official status in the country. Therefore, there might not be explicit desire to acquire Veneto in Chipilo, or to incorporate features of Veneto into Spanish.

Regarding parents’ ethnicity, as predicted, participants whose parents are both Chipileños showed significantly more ND use in comparison to the other groups. Surprisingly, however, participants with only Chipileño fathers also produced significantly more ND than participants with only Chipileño mothers. Even though mothers seem to be a family’s language carrier, according to general beliefs, the participants with only a Chipileño mother preferred the SN variant more than those with only a Chipileño father. One possible reason for these results has to do with the man’s role in the family. Chipilo is known as a patriarchal community, with the man being the breadwinner and head of the family. Females usually stay at home taking care of their children, unlike participant CHFV7, who is also a merchant. In some interviews, a few of the participants with a monolingual Mexican father, commented that their mothers were making them speak Spanish from birth when their father was around in order not to show disrespect towards him, because he did not speak Veneto as in (6).
(6) I: ¿Y usted aprendió el español antes del véneto, sí?

‘And you learnt Spanish prior to Veneto, right?’

CHMHV1: Sí precisamente por la cuestión familiar. Mi madre se casa con uno que no habla el véneto y por el respeto a la figura personal y paternal, no habla en véneto… ni siquiera nos enseña a nosotros hablar el véneto… Mi madre cuando era niño, nunca me habló en véneto… nunca.

‘Yes, precisely for family reasons. My mother got married with a person who does not speak Veneto and out of respect for his personal and paternal figure, she does not speak in Veneto… she does not even teach us to speak Veneto… My mother, when I was a kid, never spoke to me in Veneto… never.’

On the other hand, participants whose father was Chipileño reported using Veneto at home most of the time with their grandparents, their fathers, and their monolingual mothers. After a while, a monolingual mother usually started comprehending the Veneto language. These findings are consistent with Romani’s (1992) results, in which six (46%) Chipileño males in the study passed Veneto to their children, in comparison to only two (16%) Chipileño females (p. 45). She furthermore claimed that in mixed marriages when a mother was a monolingual Mexican speaker, three speakers (30%) in the study acquired Veneto as L1, three speakers (30%) acquired Veneto as L2, and four other speakers acquired both languages simultaneously (p. 46). In the same families, the woman usually acquired Veneto so the use of Veneto at home was very high. However, Barnes’s (2009) results from background reports indicated that participants from mixed marriages felt a higher degree of linguistic insecurity when speaking in Veneto, and some of them rarely spoke the language. In the present research, participants were not explicitly asked about linguistic insecurity while speaking Veneto, yet most of the bilingual speakers indicated native knowledge of Veneto and its predominant use as an L1 at home. Therefore, it is likely that all interviewed bilingual speakers speak Veneto fluently, and thus the transfer from Veneto into Spanish is possible. Thus, this portion of the Hypothesis was partly confirmed: bilingual speakers were the only ones to use ND, but, unexpectedly, it appeared more in speakers with only a Chipileño father than with only a Chipileño mother. Additionally, from personal
observations and interviews, a number of males commented that from an early age, they used to spend more time with their fathers helping them at their jobs. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that their speech resembles the speech of their fathers and other males working at the same job. The results of the current project confirm the resemblance in speech patterns, specifically in their use of ND, between younger males and those participants with Chipileño fathers. Females, on the other hand, showed similar patterns to the participants with Chipileño mothers; both groups preferred the SN variant. These results can also be explained due to a tighter connection and interaction between a mother and a daughter, rather than a daughter and a father. In other words, we can speculate that mothers transmit the patterns of their speech more to daughters than to sons. As a result, we see differences in distribution of ND not only among males and females, but also between males with a Chipileño father and females with a Chipileño mother. Since the goal of the current project was not to interview the family members and compare their speech patterns, this prediction merits further research.

As for the age groups, the initial Hypothesis was not confirmed: the age group variable did not have a significant effect on the rate of ND overall. Yet, younger speakers showed a significantly higher preference for ND use than older speakers, specifically among males. This result suggests a slight generational change of ND use in progress. There are several factors that may account for generational differences. In Tararova (2012), I explained that the younger group is proud of their Italian roots and therefore may show a higher preference for ND use. For the most part, the older group, specifically males, separated the domains of the two languages without inserting any features from Veneto into Spanish. Romani (1992) found that younger generations rated themselves higher in self-reports in Veneto than did older generations, due to increased interaction of the older group with monolingual Spanish speakers for trade and other businesses in the past. The data from self-reports indicated that the older group showed a lower rate of Spanish competence than the younger group, which may suggest that the older speakers may feel intimidated not using Spanish correctly, and thus are more conscious of their speech. Another explanation has to do with the incoming tourist flow from northern Italy, due to the centennial celebration of la hermandad ‘sisterhood’ between Chipilo and its town of origin in Italy, Segusino, in 1982. This event led to a tighter relation between the two towns. As a result, within a decade, a number of tourists from Italy visited Chipilo and vice versa. According to the locals, today in Chipilo there are many young Chipileños who travel to the northern part of Italy, specifically to Segusino. Additionally, younger speakers use Veneto at much higher rate on
social media including Facebook, Twitter, and Skype, in comparison to older speakers, who usually do not have access to computers and the Internet. Therefore, the younger group has more contact not only with the speakers in their community but also with the ones living in Italy.

What is interesting to point out, however, is that the data in the Sentence Repetition task also showed the correlation between age and sex, specifically a favouring effect of older females on the elicitation of the phenomenon. These results can possibly be interpreted as an age grading variation among females, since younger females preferred to use a standard variant and disfavour ND. Following Eckert’s argument (2017), we can speculate that older females show “more freedom” in their linguistic behaviour possibly because they spend most of their time in Chipilo, so they are “less geographically mobile” (Eckert, 2017, p. 166). Therefore, it is possible to claim that they favour ND at a higher rate than the younger group, who usually works outside of the community. Another speculation, which could also explain ND preference among older females could be due to incomplete acquisition of Spanish. During the interview and post-interview discussion, a number of older females mentioned that they only completed the first three-four years of primary school because they had to help their mothers around the house. Most of the males, on the other hand, finished secondary school, and some of them even completed university. Thus, the difference in years of education could potentially explain lower Spanish proficiency among older females and their preference for the vernacular form.

As for the sex variable, it was hypothesized that more females than males would produce the ND option. Yet, results showed the opposite: males used more ND than females in all three controlled tasks. Among the observations in sociolinguistic literature, males tend to use non-standard, vernacular forms as opposed to females, who tend to use more global and prestigious standard forms (Labov, 1991, p. 205). Furthermore, Labov (2001) claims “females conform more closely than men to sociolinguistic norms that are overtly prescribed but conform less than men when they are not” (p. 293). This is consistent with Holmquist’s (2015) findings of final /s/ in Castañer, Puerto Rico. Holmquist (2015) shows that females reacted against a change leading to the loss of final /s/, since it is considered a non-standard form. Males, on the other hand, showed a higher preference for weakening and elision of /s/, which supports Labovian claim of males’ non-standard usage. More importantly, these results show diverging patterns in the speech of younger males and females.
The findings about ND in Chipileño Spanish coincide with the results of final \( /s/ \) in Puerto Rican Spanish (Holmquist, 2015), since in both studies young males are the ones who predominantly use the “non-standard” variant. In the case of Chipilo, ND is ungrammatical in standard Spanish, so final \( no \) is a non-standard form. However, Veneto, the source of ND, is considered a prestigious variety. It is important, however, to identify the reasons why males produce a “non-standard” variant at a higher rate. Several linguists (e.g., Cameron, 2005; Gardner, 1982; Holmquist, 2015; Myers-Scotton, 2002) claim that group differences can be attributed to the social identity the group builds in order to differentiate itself from others. Recalling Ryan’s (1979) observations, mentioned in Chapter 2, “the value of language as a chief symbol of group identity is one of the major forces for the preservation of non-standard speech styles of dialects” (cited in Gardner, 1982, p. 147). Furthermore, Ryan (1979) claims in order to maintain a distinct style of speech it is crucial to maintain one’s own identity. My previous work (Tararova, 2012) shows that Veneto is correlated with Chipileño identity and loss of Veneto will lead to the loss of the bilingual identity. More importantly, the results from Tararova (2012) showed two findings relevant to the discussion on gender differences. First, I found a high correlation between Chipileño identity and self-reported Veneto use, which younger males claimed to be a main indicator of their Italian roots. Second, Chipileños, specifically younger speakers, perceived negative attitudes towards them by monolingual speakers, which resulted in tighter networks among their members. These two issues, and their connection to ND preference, are discussed in the following section.

5.3 Relevance of attitudes on elicitation of the ND phenomenon

Since, in my dissertation, younger males with Chipileño parents or a Chipileño father showed significantly higher proportion of ND, I further analyzed the data from the Elicited Conversational Speech to see whether the attitudes of these bilingual speakers shed light on the results of their ND usage. In order to see whether younger male participants with Chipileño parents or only a Chipileño father showed differences (from monolinguals and those with only a Chipileño mother) in their perceived attitudes in this project, I analyzed responses to the following question from the interviews I conducted: “How do monolingual speakers perceive
you [Chipileños] with regard to your speech (and identity)?” 32 The responses were grouped into positive or negative responses, and coded as 0 or 1, respectively. If participants answered “normally”, “fine”, “it is all good”, “nothing negative”, their answers were coded as 0. However, if the participants mentioned negative words or phrases, including “racism”, “they [monolingual speakers] make fun of us”, “they call us (rude and presumptuous) strangers”, these answers were coded as 1. Since young males (with two Chipileño parents or just a Chipileño father) showed differences in contrast to other groups, I ran a 2x2 contingency chi-square test to compare young males with the other groups (e.g., younger and older females of three ethnic groups, old males, males with only a Chipileño mother). The results show significant differences, as seen in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1. The reported perception of monolingual speakers towards Chipileños with regard to their speech and identity, comparing young CH/CHP males to all other groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Response</th>
<th>Positive Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young males with Chipileño parents (CH) or Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>73% (n=11)</td>
<td>27% (n=4)</td>
<td>N=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other groups</td>
<td>39% (n=25)</td>
<td>61% (n=39)</td>
<td>N=64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2$ (1, N=79) =5.75, $p=.02$. The result is significant at $p< .05$

As seen in Table 5.1, the majority of young males (73%) acknowledged negative attitudes towards them by monolingual speakers, whereas the other groups answered positively for the most part (61%). The difference between the two groups is statistically significant. In other words, these results confirm that the young males with Chipileño parents and a Chipileño father significantly differ in their responses, compared to the other groups.

Since young females showed a higher preference for the standard variant, as reported in Chapter 4, I also compared the above young males to young females of all three ethnic groups. The difference was also significant. Table 5.2 shows the distribution of a total of 32 young participants, 15 males and 17 females.

32 I first was only interested to know whether participants felt any tension between the groups due to Chipileños’ speech. Then, I asked them whether monolingual speakers had any negative attitudes towards their identity.
Table 5.2. The reported perception of monolingual speakers towards Chipileños with regard to their speech and identity, comparing young CH/CHP males to young females of three ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Response</th>
<th>Positive Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young males with Chipileño parents (CH) or Chipileño father (CHP)</td>
<td>73% (n=11)</td>
<td>27% (n=4)</td>
<td>N=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young females (all ethnic groups)</td>
<td>28% (n=5)</td>
<td>63% (n=12)</td>
<td>N=17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (1, N=32) =6.15, p=.01$. The result is significant at $p<0.05$.

As reported in Table 5.2, the majority of young males (73%) confirmed the existence of negative attitudes towards them by monolingual speakers, whereas these young females more often responded positively. This difference is significant. The results in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 confirmed the earlier findings: Chipileños do feel negative attitudes and tensions towards them from monolingual speakers. These results highlight the fact that young males differ from young females in their responses. As my previous findings (Tararova, 2012) revealed, since young males feel racism and other tensions against them, they want to isolate themselves and be different from the monolingual speakers. Most males, while answering this, not only mentioned that they are considered as foreigners or strangers in Mexico, but also that their speech is not the same as that of monolingual speakers. Interestingly though, a few male participants claimed that young speakers, including themselves, do mix Spanish and Veneto sometimes while speaking in Spanish, since they do not want to speak similarly to the monolingual group.

Many females, on the other hand, claimed that they speak the same Spanish as monolingual speakers and that they considered themselves Mexicans. That said, a few females mentioned that while studying in high school and university in Puebla, they were mocked or even bullied because of their accent and mixing of the two languages. As a result, they stopped using Veneto outside of the community in order to fit in with the rest of the population. They stated, however, that they do not feel these tensions anymore and therefore seem to interact well with non-Chipileños. During the Elicited Conversational Speech carried out in this study, many female participants confirmed that the Veneto language is prestigious, but that it was considered incorrect to combine Spanish and Veneto when speaking one of the languages. However, the results showed that aside from having negative attitudes towards the mixture of two languages, 13 women, including some of those who commented negatively, still used ND in the Sentence
Repetition Task. Even though the Sentence Repetition Task was a formal controlled task, it contained many distractors, which made the participants less aware of producing sentences with ND in this task. In other words, it seems like that sometimes, females are not aware of their use of the incoming variant (Labov, 2001).

In summary, regarding the third research question, parents’ ethnicity and sex have an effect on the production of ND in Chipileño Spanish in two tasks. Participants whose parents are both Chipileños produced a higher number of ND tokens. Significant effects were also shown for participants with only a Chipileño father, in terms of producing a higher number of ND tokens than for the participants with a Chipileño mother. This may be attributed to the superior status of the man within the family which causes the family to use more Veneto at home, as well as a closer relationship among males which lead to similar speech patterns. As for gender differences, significantly more male speakers than female speakers showed ND use in this study, against expectations. These results can be supported by interaction of negative attitudes and ND use, which construct young male social identity. Though female speakers sometimes use ND, their rate of use is low, possibly due to conscious and cautious speech decisions by female speakers. Concerning the age groups, although the effect was not significant, there was a tendency among the younger group to use ND at a higher rate, possibly due to their competence in two languages and high rate of social media use. These findings, of an effect of speaker’s gender and ethnicity, represent a novel contribution to the broader project of capturing the phenomena of retention and transfer in Chipileño Spanish, which is discussed further in the next section.

5.4 Implications to the field of language contact-induced change

I have addressed the major question of this dissertation: which factors motivate and favour the transfer of a particular linguistic feature? Overall, the project highlights the importance of social factors on elicitation of the phenomenon. There are several indications that point to this conclusion. First of all, as previous literature has shown (e.g., Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Thomason
& Kauffman, 1988), typological congruence between languages in contact facilitates feature transfer. This is the case of this dissertation because Chipilo is a community with two typologically similar Romance languages, Spanish and Veneto. With regard to structural similarities, Spanish and Veneto have the same word order (S-NEG-V-O), so transfer between the two languages is favoured. Transfer from Veneto of lexical, phonological, and discourse features has previously been attested in Chipileño Spanish, which supports the arguments by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Silva-Corvalán (2001) regarding the facilitation of transfer features between typologically and structurally similar languages. In this sense, we could potentially adopt Weinreich’s (1953) proposal about no filling the structural and functional gap in the recipient language. In other words, since the final no with the falling intonation is ungrammatical and absent in Spanish, some bilinguals transfer final no into their Spanish to intensify the negated context and reaffirm their negated idea. Due to the structural similarities between the two languages, the insertion of no does not seem to ‘violate’ the structure of Spanish. It is important to remember, however, the use of ND was restricted to certain contexts only; therefore, it is crucial to obtain more data in order to test the above prediction.

Another important consideration of feature transfer has to do with extralinguistic factors, specifically intensity of contact and attitudes towards the language. As discussed in Chapter 2, Thomason and Kaufman (1988) propose a borrowing scale from a dominant language, depending on the intensity of contact between two languages. They suggest that casual contact between languages can lead to lexical transfer only, whereas close contact leads to heavy structural borrowing, which eventually results in minority language loss. The situation in Chipilo is unusual since Chipileño speakers have been residing in Mexico for over a century and up until the present day are fluent bilinguals, in spite of the fact that Veneto is an oral variety and is not taught in schools. Since contact between monolingual Spanish speakers and bilinguals was limited in the past, Veneto was used as the main means of communication inside the community, similar to the case of the Welsh community in Trelew, in the Chubut Valley of Argentina (Coupland & Garrett, 2010). But unlike the Welsh community, whose language became stigmatized due to government policies, Veneto still holds a prestigious status in the community (Barnes, 2009; Tararova, 2012). However, contact between both groups in Chipilo today is inevitable and Spanish has become an important tool needed for interaction and education. Bilingual speakers still treat Veneto as a prestigious and dominant language in familiar settings, although they also use Spanish on a daily basis. Since both languages are used
in the community, the borrowing scale that Thomason and Kaufman (1988) propose is not just applicable to Veneto but also to Spanish. According to their argument, only casual contact between the two languages can lead to minority language preservation. In the case of Chipilo, it is not true since bilingual speakers use two languages interchangeably. As mentioned earlier, Barnes (2009) mentions all three types of transfer, lexical, phonological and morphosyntactic, have been attested in both languages in the speech of bilingual speakers but there was no indication of loss of any of the features in either of the languages (see Chapter 2).

Therefore, the case of ND becomes an excellent example of feature transfer to Chipileño Spanish, particularly among young male speakers. ND seems to be a non-standard, vernacular feature that males incorporate in their speech in Spanish at a higher rate than do females. Due to the prestige of Veneto today, Chipileño males may transfer Veneto features into Spanish and use them unconsciously to sound different from monolingual speakers. Moreover, ND can be treated as a marker of social in-group identity among males who try to be different, specifically from the “out-group,” due to negatively perceived attitudes and tensions against them. Females, on the other hand, prefer to separate the domains of use of Spanish and Veneto and use standard forms, in this case standard negation, more often while speaking in Spanish. Therefore, ND may also be a marker of covert prestige (Labov, 2001), as females seem to consciously avoid the option of using ND in Spanish, since it is a non-standard variant. If this is true, it is possible to assume that they use both languages more consciously, and probably insert Veneto features into their Spanish speech less frequently. Therefore, based on these conclusions, ND transfer appears to be a marker of male in-group separation from the rest of the community.

One of the most important findings of this research is that any morphosyntactic phenomenon should be studied through the interplay of structural and non-structural factors that promote or impede contact-induced changes in a given community. In other words, both linguistic and social factors should be taken into consideration when studying a phenomenon in a bilingual setting, in order to see which factor(s) condition language transfer and change. But can we conclude that both condition the appearance of ND? Present findings did not show the linguistic factors studied to be strong predictors for ND production. Even though second negative mention seems to be a predictor favouring the use of ND, its use is restricted to a specific social group only, i.e., younger males. Only that group used ND at a higher frequency than found in the other groups, suggesting their preference of a non-standard vernacular variant. Thus, in the case of
ND in Chipileño Spanish, social factors interact with linguistic ones. The findings of this investigation complement those of earlier studies, specifically Thomason & Kauffman’s (1988) proposal of external causes of language change and highlight the importance of social factors as primary determinants of contact induced change.

5.5 Directions for further studies and conclusions

While this dissertation provides a sociolinguistic profile of ND in Chipilo, it also opens lines for future research. The project focused on transfer of the ND phenomenon from Veneto into the Spanish of bilingual speakers in Chipilo. However, there were no samples obtained from the Veneto language spoken in Chipilo. Poletto (personal communication, January 30, 2016) claims that ND is a frequent phenomenon in Veneto (in Italy), occurring often in informal conversation among all speakers of the community. Given that there has not been any quantitative sociolinguistic study on the distribution of negation in Veneto in Italy or in Chipilo, it is crucial to collect data, using the same tasks as used above in Spanish, in order to see whether the distribution of the variant is the same in the two languages, and in the two locations (Chipilo and Veneto). More specifically, by taking into consideration the same social and linguistic factors, we will be able to see whether ND in Veneto in Italian is favoured in similar contexts among similar social groups. Poletto (personal communication, January 30, 2016) stated that for Veneto in Italy, the use of ND has not changed much in the past 100 years. Therefore, it is appropriate to compare the Veneto spoken in Mexico to the variety spoken in Italy. Even though languages do change over time, investigating negation in Veneto in Italy may lead to further understanding of the occurrence of ND in specific contexts. Additionally, a comparison with the ND of the Veneto spoken in Italy would determine if characteristics present in the Veneto of Chipilo are unique to Chipilo due to contact with Spanish, or if these are the characteristics of the Veneto language itself, providing further insight of potential effects of minority languages on majority languages.

Further research should also investigate the frequency of the third form of negation (V– NEG), which occurred in the discourse of a few bilingual speakers. Based on acoustic measurements,
this final no had a falling contour, similar to the final contour in ND. In her Italo-Mexican dictionary, MacKay (2002) shows that this third form of negation with the falling contour is a possible variant in Veneto in Mexico. The findings in this dissertation, while preliminary, suggest that there may have been transfer of this structure into some bilingual speakers’ Spanish. Further work is required to establish the distribution of the V–NEG structure with the falling intonational contour in Chipileño Spanish. A comparison with the same structure in Veneto from Chipilo, specifically its frequency and distribution, will determine whether the phenomenon of negation is a change in progress (Jespersen, 1917), or whether some variants (SN, ND, V–NEG) have their own stable contexts of use. Based on the findings from the present dissertation, negation in Chipileño Spanish falls under the first stage of Jespersen Cycle (NEG V), since SN occurred at the highest rate among all the participants. The findings regarding the age differences show however, that younger males used ND at the higher rate than all the older group or females. Therefore, younger males seem to alternate between two forms; this alternation corresponds to the first and second stages of Jespersen Cycle.

Further study regarding other social variables such as education and occupation can provide further explanation of ND use. For example, most Chipileños study or work outside of the community to get higher education and better salaries. Their use of Veneto outside the home is minimal, so it is possible to assume that their Spanish is much better than the Spanish of speakers who do not attend university or who work inside the community using Veneto on a regular basis. Therefore, it is crucial to analyse these two variables by collecting more detailed samples about ND use and its social distribution in Veneto. This may shed further light on the sex and ethnicity effects reported here.

One important linguistic variable worth examining in the future is frequency of use of the phenomenon. In Chipileño Spanish, two variants, SN and ND, are possible in some negative contexts. This project did not find any contexts where ND was solely used. ND was used only among 38 of the 79 bilingual speakers, but did not appear in the same specific negative contexts among all of them. These results show that there is an alternation and optionality between variants. This is consistent with the arguments for distributed morphology made by Adger and Smith (2005), who propose that it is possible to have ongoing alternations between variants due to two phonological outputs of a variable, thus suggesting optionality in the use of the variants. Moreover, Adger and Smith (2005) argue that such factors as social identity and frequency of
use could potentially determine which of the two variants would be used in a specific context. Since some speakers did actually use ND, in the future it would be interesting to see if specific verbs or phrases that are more frequently used (e.g., \textit{no me gusta no} ‘I do NEG like NEG) favour the ND \textit{no} in a given negative scenario. The type of verb would determine whether some of these structures are actually frozen forms, which were lexicalized (King, 2001) and transferred into the Spanish of the bilingual speakers (Sankoff & Vincent, 1980). It would also be of interest to analyse verbs which carry negative connotation (e.g., \textit{criticar} ‘criticize’, \textit{negar} ‘negate’, \textit{odiar} ‘hate’) to see whether these ‘activate’ a negative context and trigger ND. Further analysis of the syntactic nature of ND would be necessary to discover and research additional linguistic factors which can affect its distribution.

In future investigations, alternative methods should be used, specifically interactional tasks, in order to gain further insight into negation in Chipilo. Since I am not a local Veneto speaker, interactional tasks will be beneficial since participants might feel more comfortable talking to one another, rather than one-on-one with an outsider researcher. By collecting interactional data from two or three people simultaneously, a researcher will potentially be able to obtain more natural and spontaneous responses, which would be used to analyse the nature and the contexts of ND. Also, it would be interesting to see potential trends that might be specific to each family. If we find similarities in distribution of the phenomenon among family members, we could conclude that other factors, such as setting and interlocutors, trigger ND.

Finally, the findings in this project raise further intriguing questions regarding the nature and extent of the ND phenomenon in Chipilo, as well as in other bilingual varieties. For example, if we apply the same tasks in the three other varieties that exhibit ND (Brazilian Portuguese, Catalan in contact with Spanish, and the Spanish of Corrientes), what will be the distribution of ND in these varieties? Will similar social factors favour the frequency of the phenomenon? Since the historical context in Argentina is different to the one in Chipilo, the results might vary. For example, in the Spanish of Corrientes, ND was extended into the speech of monolinguals, and so the results for monolingual and bilingual speakers in the area may be similar. Also, since previous studies found no generational differences in ND use, a significant age effect will probably not appear. In the case of bilingual Catalan-Spanish speakers, the results might be somewhat similar with the ones presented in this study, since Catalans have strived to identify themselves as a distinct group in relationship to the rest of the population (e.g., Ubalde, Alarcón,
Therefore, they might show similar patterns to the ones from this dissertation as far as demonstrating an ethnicity effect. As for Brazilian Portuguese, it might be slightly challenging to compare monolingual Portuguese speakers with Veneto-Portuguese bilingual speakers, since in both varieties, ND is used in specific contexts. It would be still interesting to see whether the two groups produce the variant with the same frequency in the same linguistic contexts, or whether we can see an effect of different grammatical conditioning between the two varieties.

In conclusion, due to sustained societal bilingualism, Chipilo is a fruitful area in which to carry out research on language contact. Current research on Chipilo provides important insights into the long-term consequences of language contact and transfer of morphosyntactic phenomena from a minority language to a majority language. This research on negation in Chipileño Spanish can provide a base for studying negation in other communities. To my knowledge, no prior study has focused in detail on any morphological properties in Chipileño Spanish or Veneto from a sociolinguistic point of view. This dissertation is the first study to investigate the distribution of this specific phenomenon, ND, in bilingual speech in Mexico. This project departs from previous reports on negation in Chipilo by using innovative methodology, combining traditional sociolinguistic interview methods with controlled tasks targeting specific contexts, in order to better elicit ND and understand the results of these languages in contact.

More specifically, this study presented findings regarding both social and linguistic factors influencing ND in Chipileño Spanish. As discussed, the ND variant was infrequent, present only among some bilingual speakers. ND preference varied across the four tasks, showing the highest frequency in the Sentence Repetition Task among young bilingual male speakers, particularly participants with two Chipileño parents or just a Chipileño father. However, as Eckert (1997) stresses, “the effect of factors is not uniform but rather should be specific to each community” (cited in Díaz-Campos, 2015, p. 231). It is hoped that this study will pave the way for more such research, and lead to a deeper understanding of the interaction of languages in contact.
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Appendix A
Background Questionnaire

Department of Spanish & Portuguese
University of Toronto

A. Personal Information

• Sex: □ Male □ Female
• Year of Birth: ____________________________________________
• Place of Birth: City _____________________ Country ____________________________
• Occupation: ____________________________________________
• Highest Level of Schooling: □ Secondary □ College/Professional □ University

B. First Language

What is your first language? ____________________________________________

What is the first language of: your mother? _______________________, your father? ____________

Did you learn your first language from birth? □ Yes □ No

• If you answered ‘No’ to the question above, please explain:
  ________________________________________________
  ________________________________________________

Which language(s) did you speak at home as a child? ________________________________

Is your first language the language with which you are the most comfortable? □ Yes □ No
• If you answered ‘No’ to the question above, please explain:

__________________________________________________________________________

Language Use
Which language(s) do you use (Indicate approximate percentage, e.g. 0, 50, 100%):

At school

__________________________________________________________________________

At home

__________________________________________________________________________

At work

__________________________________________________________________________

In social situations

__________________________________________________________________________

D. Second Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Second Languages</th>
<th>Second Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At what age did you begin to learn your 2nd language?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where did you learn your 2nd language? Give place and years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were your teachers native speakers of this language?</td>
<td>☐ Subject ☐ Medium of Instruction</td>
<td>☐ Subject ☐ Medium of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you learn this language as a subject or was it the principal medium of instruction?</td>
<td>☐ Subject ☐ Medium of Instruction</td>
<td>☐ Subject ☐ Medium of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately how many hours a week do you use this language? Specify for each of speaking, listening and reading.</td>
<td>Speaking : _____ hrs Listening : _____ hrs Reading : _____ hrs</td>
<td>Speaking : _____ hrs Listening : _____ hrs Reading : _____ hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Please rate your linguistic ability in each of your second languages in the following areas by checking the appropriate answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Near-Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>READING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRITING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEAKING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LISTENING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL COMPETENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you know any other second languages? Please specify:

____________________________________________________________
Appendix B
Elicited Conversational Speech Questions

Q1. ¿Usted nació en Italia? Y sus padres?

Q2. ¿Conoce Italia? Le gustaría ir a Treviso?

Q3. ¿Le gusta Chipilo? Qué le gusta de Chipilo? Y ¿Qué no le gusta en la vida de Chipilo?

Q4. ¿Qué le gustaría cambiar en su vida?

Q5. Y bueno, ¿Usted es mexicana/o, verdad? Y sus hijos?/ esposo/a?

Q6. ¿Trabaja Usted (pregunta a las personas que no trabajan)? ¿Le gustaría trabajar en qué?

Q7. ¿Aprendió español primero? ¿Y sus hijos? ¿Y por qué aprendieron el véneto primero?

Q8. ¿Qué opina de su idioma? Cree que es diferente del idioma de véneto en Treviso? ¿Por qué/ Cómo?

Q9. ¿Cuáles son unas características específicas de véneto? ¿Y de español chipileño?

Q10. ¿El véneto de sus abuelos es diferente de véneto de Ustedes? (o el véneto de la gente mayor es diferente del véneto de los jóvenes?)

Q11. ¿Todos chipileños hablan igual? ¿Por qué?

Q12. ¿El español chipileño es diferente de español de los mexicanos monolingües? ¿En qué sentido? Unos ejemplos?

Q13. ¿En su opinión, por qué es diferente? ¿Cree que hay una incorporación de unos elementos de véneto al español chipileño?

Q14. ¿Le gustaría hablar como los mexicanos monolingües? ¿Por qué (no)?

Q15. ¿Y cómo les perciben los mexicanos monolingües en cuanto a su habla?

Q15. ¿Y qué opina de su véneto?

Q16. ¿Cree que es diferente de véneto de sus abuelos? ¿De la gente de Treviso?
Q17. ¿Cree que ha cambiado veneto? ¿Hay algunas cosas que les decían sus padres, abuelos pero que ustedes ya no usan? (¿unas palabras, cosas?)

Q18. ¿Y lee en veneto? ¿Qué lee? ¿Es difícil? ¿Por qué?

Q19. ¿Y lee en español?

Q20. ¿Fue difícil aprender el español?
0. **Juan no tiene leche en casa y tuvo que ir a la tienda para comprarla. Cuando llega a la tienda recoge la leche, paga y regresa a su casa.**

¿Por qué fue Juan a la tienda?
Se le acabó la leche
Fue a comprar pan
Para compras de la leche

¿Regresó rápido Juan a la casa?
Sí, regresó rápido.
No, regresaba rápido.
Sí, Juan volvió a la casa rápido.

1. **Rosario organizó una fiesta en su casa, pero nadie se presentó, ni siquiera su mejor amiga, Ana.**

¿Vino alguien a la fiesta de Rosario?
No, nadie vino
No, vino nadie
No, nadie vino no

¿Vino la mejor amiga de Rosario, Ana?
No, tampoco vino.
No, no vino tampoco no.
No, vino no.

2. **Ana cumplió años el lunes pero decidió hacer su fiesta el sábado anterior porque nadie podía venir el lunes.**

¿Hizo Ana su fiesta de cumpleaños el lunes?
No, no la hizo el lunes.
No, no la hizo no.
No, no la hacía el lunes no.

¿Podía venir alguien a la fiesta de Ana el lunes?
No, nadie podía.
No, no podía nadie no.
No, nadie no pudo no.

3. **Juanito llegó de la escuela con las manos todas manchadas de gis. Como la comida ya estaba servida, el papá lo ayudó a lavarse rápido.**

¿Qué le hizo el papá a Juanito?
Le lavó sus manos.
Le lavó sus orejas.
Le lavó las manos.

¿Por qué tenía las manos sucias Juanito?
Porque siempre ha dibujado con las tizas.
Porque hoy ha dibujado con tiza en la escuela.
Porque hoy dibujó con tiza en la escuela.

4. **En seguida cuando conocí a Laura, me cayó muy bien. Lo primero que noté de ella fue su cabello: lacio, largo y de un color natural hermoso. Sin embargo, un día la vi y no podía creer lo que estaba viendo.**

¿Qué hizo Laura con su cabello?
Se cortó su cabello
Cortó su cabello
Se cortó el cabello.

¿Por qué se cortó el cabello?
Porque no quiso arreglarlo.
Porque hoy ha hecho una donación.
Porque no quería cuidarlo no.

5. Mañana es el día del examen, pero Susana salió a pasear con sus amigas.
¿Qué pasó al final?
Susana no pasó el examen.
Susana no ha pasado su examen.
Susana no pasó el examen no.

¿Por qué le pasó eso?
Porque no estudió no.
Porque no ha estudiado.
Porque no estudió

6. La mamá de Juanito siempre lo regaña porque a él se le olvida cepillarse los dientes casi todos los días. Hoy cuando la mamá entró al baño, notó que el cepillo de Juanito aún estaba seco. Entonces en cuanto salió del baño le preguntó:

¿Te lavaste los dientes hoy, Juanito?
No mamá, no los lavé.
No mamá, no lavé mis dientes.
No mamá, no me los he lavado.

7. Pedro, el hermano mayor de Juanito, sale de su cuarto riéndose de su hermano y dice:
No, no se los cepilló no
No, no se los cepillaba los dientes.
No, no se los cepilló.

8. Diego trabaja en una oficina donde existe una norma formal y profesional de vestirse. Sin embargo, Diego siempre usa sus tenis en vez de usar unos zapatos de vestir. Varias veces le regañó su jefe y le pidió que comprara unos zapatos.

¿Qué hace Diego que no le gusta a su jefe?
Se pone sus tenis cada vez que va al trabajo
Pone sus tenis al trabajo.
Se pone los tenis al trabajo.

¿Le gusta al jefe cómo se viste Diego?
No, no le gustan.
No, no le gustan los tenis.
No, no le gustan no.

9. Juan está de vacaciones pero no le gusta el servicio del hotel. Un día él conoció a Jorge y empezaron a llevarse muy bien porque tienen mucho en común. Juan dice que jamás vuelve a este hotel y Jorge está de acuerdo.

¿Regresa Jorge al hotel?
Tampoco regresa
Regresa tampoco
Tampoco regresa no.

¿Le gusta el servicio a Jorge?
No le gusta
No le gusta no
No le gustaba
Appendix D
Stimuli: Sentence Completion Task

1) Luis pinta todos los días y María se supone que practique el piano. Ella no toca el piano suficiente porque prefiere salir con sus amigos. En cuanto al arte y la música lo importante es practicar. Luis pinta a diario pero María no…

2) Carlos y Roberta son cocineros. Los dos trabajan en un restaurante. A Carlos le encanta cocinar y siempre piensa en nuevas recetas. Roberta, sin embargo, es muy perezosa y trabaja solo por el dinero. Hoy es una fiesta grande en el restaurante. Carlos quiere hacer una nueva receta de flan pero Roberta no…

3) La semana que viene es el cumpleaños de Lorena. Todos fueron invitados. Sin embargo, Juan se fue a Europa y Jorge está enfermo. En cuanto a la celebración, todos van a la fiesta de Lorena, pero Juan y Jorge no…

4) Hay tres trapos en la mesa. Luisa estaba limpiando todo el día pero se enfadó porque solo un trapo limpia bien sin dejar ninguna mancha. En cuanto a limpiar bien, un trapo limpia perfectamente bien pero los otros dos no…

5) Juan está acostado. Hace una hora le llamó Rodrigo y le preguntó si quería ir a una fiesta con él. Juan le dijo que no quería porque estaba cansado. Sin embargo, suena el teléfono. Es Rodrigo. Le pregunta otra vez si quiere ir con él porque no quiere ir solo. Juan no cambia de opinión y le dice que no. Entonces, Rodrigo va a la fiesta, pero Juan no quiere…

6) Gabriel odia los hongos. No los puede comer con absolutamente nada. Un día su novia le preparó una cena que tenía hongos. Entonces él se enojó y le dice “Yo no los quiero….”

7) Rossana se va a vivir sola el próximo año pero aún no sabe cocinar. Entonces cada semana su mamá le enseña a preparar cosas nuevas. Sin embargo, Rossana nunca puede recordar los ingredientes. La mamá siempre le dice a Rossana que tiene que anotar todo en su libreta, pero Rossana no…
8) Jorge y Gustavo se fueron a Puebla a comer. Normalmente, Jorge va a Puebla 2 o 3 veces por semana. Sin embargo, a Gustavo le gusta estar en Chipilo y por eso no…

9) Sara y Nelson van a la agencia de viajes a preguntar por su próximo viaje. Sara quiere ir a Europa, pero Nelson no…
Appendix E
Stimuli: Sentence Repetition Task

No nos levantamos tarde
Juan no trabaja
Jorge no come las enchiladas
No nos levantamos tarde no
Juan no trabaja no
Jorge no come las enchiladas no
No se mezclan no
Nosotros no hablamos italiano no
Aquí no hablan mucho no
Nadie trabaja no
Nadie se levanta tarde no
Nadie se mezcla no
Ningún chico come doce tortillas no
Ninguna mujer habla italiano no
Ningún hombre toma mucho no
No se mezcla nadie no
No trabaja nadie no
No pasa ningún chico no
No habla italiano ninguna mujer no
No se levanta nadie tarde no
No vive ningún hombre aquí no
Todos trabajan aquí sí
Se mesclan muchos no
Ese carro huele mal no
Este teléfono funciona sí
Todos los chicos vienen no
Quieres esta enchilada sí

---

33 Since the utterances were produced with no intonation, participants had to decide how to produce the sentences. Therefore, there are no punctuation marks shown.
Vive Alfonso en una casa rosa
En una casa hay unas rosas en la mesa
La taza azul es de Sonia
A dónde Simón Pérez sale a pasear los sábados
Ah, este carro es carísimo para mí
Esta carretera es muy peligrosa, especialmente en la noche
Con quién trabaja Roberto en la panadería
Hablo un poco de chino
Ya no tomo con Adolfo
Apoco ya no tomas con Adolfo
La familia Boretti vive en Victoria
Beto vive en Bogotá
Apoco don Gustavo es tu abuelo
Basilio y Victor venden bebidas baratas
Dear Participant:

We are currently conducting research on monolingual and bilingual language production and perception. Participation in this study will involve: (a) an interview with a researcher about general topics about the community, the language and the culture; (b) repeating some sentences in Spanish; (c) listening to some stories with missing ending and finishing them; (d) listening to some stories with questions and possible answers and deciding on acceptability of the responses and (e) filling out a questionnaire concerning your linguistic background. The responses that you produce in (a), (b), (c) and (d) will be recorded.

Please note that all materials will be treated confidentially. Only the undersigned will have access to the forms and data, both of which will be coded with a participant number. The questionnaire and data will be stored separately from any form containing your name and personal information and will contain no links to such forms. Names of participants will never be revealed in any reports of this study.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may withdraw at any time. Total time involved will be approximately 1 hour 15 minutes. You will receive 40 pesos for your participation in this study, based on the number of completed tasks.

I very much appreciate your willingness to participate. To indicate your consent, please sign the attached form. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to talk to me now or to contact me or the ethics review office (ethics.review@utoronto.ca) subsequent to your participation.

Yours sincerely,

Olga Tararova

Dr. Laura Colantoni
Appendix G
Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

I, the undersigned, have been informed of the nature of the present study, including the tasks to be undertaken, and agree to participate. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time.

Name (please print):

Signature:

Date:
## Appendix H
Exhaustive list of negative doubling in four tasks for four speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ2</td>
<td>2.1 No, nadie vino <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>2.2 No, no vino tampoco <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>3.1 Yo no los quiero, no me gustan <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>4.1 No nos levantamos tarde <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Susana no pasó el examen <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>2.4 Porque no estudió <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>3.2 Pero Juan y Jorge no van a la fiesta <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>4.2 Juan no trabaja <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 No, no le gusta <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>2.6 No, no se los cepilló <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Jorge no come las enchiladas <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Porque no quería cuidarlo <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>2.8 No, no, podía nadie <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 No se mezclan mucho <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 Tampoco regresa <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Nosotros no hablamos italiano <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 Aquí no hablan mucho <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ5</td>
<td>2.10 No vino <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Pero Nelson no quiere ir <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td>4.7 Nadie trabaja <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.11 Susana no pasó el examen <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 Nadie se levanta tarde <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.12 No, no, podía nadie <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 Nadie se mezcla <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.13 No le gusta <strong>no</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.10 Ningún chico come doce tortillas <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11 Ninguna mujer habla italiano <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12 Ningún hombre toma mucho <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13 No se mezclan nadie <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.14 No trabaja nadie <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15 No habla italiano ninguna mujer <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.16 No vive ningún hombre <strong>no</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24 Nadie se mezcla no.</td>
<td>4.25 Ningún chico come doce tortillas no.</td>
<td>4.26 No se mezcla nadie no.</td>
<td>4.27 No trabaja nadie no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.28 No pasa ningún chico no.</td>
<td>4.29 No se levanta nadie tarde no.</td>
<td>4.30 No vive ningún hombre no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHJ7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 No les gusta no</td>
<td>2.14 No vino no</td>
<td>3.4 Pero María no toca piano diario no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 Porque no estudió no</td>
<td>2.16 No, no se los cepilló no.</td>
<td>3.5 Pero Rossana no lo anota no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17 Porque no quería cuidarlo no.</td>
<td>2.18 No, no la hizo no.</td>
<td>3.6 Pero los otros dos no limpian no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19 No le gusta no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHFV7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 No les gusta no</td>
<td>2.20 No le gusta no.</td>
<td>3.7 Pero Nelson no quiere ir a Italia, pues no quiere ir a Europa no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36 No trabaja nadie no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>