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ABSTRACT

This study analyzes possession as it is expressed grammatically in Spanish in contact with English among multidialectal Spanish speakers. The objective is to investigate the possibility of a change in progress in what pertains to this feature as observed across two generations of Hispanic speakers in New York: immigrant parents who have been in the U.S. for more than 20 years, and their young adult children who were born in the U.S.

After discussing relevant concepts in language contact and highlighting other studies carried out in the U.S. that add to the understanding of possession, the possessive grammatical category is explained in terms of its broader classification of attributive and predicative constructions in contexts of inalienable and alienable possession.

Quantitative analysis, using Goldvarb X, revealed that in inalienable contexts the first generation tended to restrict the use of the possessive adjective, whereas the second generation allowed it more frequently. This result supports the idea of an intergenerational language variation. In the case of alienable contexts, the results showed that the options are in competition in the speech of both groups. Therefore, I concluded that children raised bilingual use the possessive differently, according to the context of inalienable vs. alienable nouns. The important role that Spanish played within the different domains allowed the article to remain active in the possessive link.

In regards to predicative possession, the initial objective was to find if a possible expansion in the use of the verb tener could be observed in bilingual contexts. Results revealed that such an increase was not significant among participants who grew up
bilingual, and that other Spanish possessive constructions were still active within their linguistic repertoire.

Among participants who have grown up bilingually, a variety of forms is observed and the use of the article determiner or the verb tener, as is expected in monolingual Spanish, still remains active within their linguistic repertoire. Therefore, in the case of the second generation speakers I conclude that the possessive construction, as it is expressed in English or Spanish, was acquired early while growing up bilingual and remained through their adulthood.
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Chapter One: Introduction
1.1 Purpose of the study

This dissertation analyzes possession as it is expressed grammatically in Spanish spoken in New York. The objective is to describe the use of possessives in Spanish by two generations: immigrants from various Spanish speaking origins and their children who were raised bilingually in the United States and who have maintained communicative fluency, oral and written, in their heritage language. This study aims to investigate the possibility of a language change that is in progress in what pertains to the possessive expression as observed across two generations.

Possession is understood in terms of a broader classification of attributive and predicative constructions. The former takes the form of nominal possession using possessive adjectives or articles to mark the relationship between the possessor and the possesum. The latter expresses the possessive link through verbs. The current work focuses on both. The possessive category is observed within intergenerational data, and patterns of use in attributive and predicative possession markers are identified. The results intend to add to the existing studies of U.S. Spanish varieties in regards to pronouns, articles, clitics and verb semantics. I intend to respond to the following research questions:

1. Is there a pattern in regards to the possessive expression that differentiates the two age groups?
2. How might interaction between English and Spanish affect variation in the Spanish possessive expression used by second generation speakers?
3. What sociolinguistic factors influence the differences in usage between the parents and their children’s expression of possession?
My hypothesis, based on previous interpretations of language contact theory, is that a bilingual child may choose a congruent form that works efficiently in both languages. Therefore, I will first describe the construction of the possessive expression in both languages and analyze the linguistic contexts where the transfer may ease the communication among bilingual speakers. Later, I will look at the data specifically searching for these constructions where the transfer is possible, and conclude if it is found in second generation bilingual speakers.

The dissertation is organized as follows: chapter one reviews the literature relevant to language contact and Spanish in the United States. Chapter two presents the theoretical framework for the study of possession as a grammatical category expressed in English and Spanish. Chapter three describes the methods employed to carry out the study, data collection and analysis. Chapter four is the quantitative analysis for attributive possession, and chapter five analyzes predicative possession. Finally, chapter six discusses whether a change is in progress across these two generations of Spanish speakers as far as the expression of possession is concerned and chapter seven concludes the dissertation. Examples presented throughout the entire dissertation are identified by codes when they are extracted from interview data, otherwise they are my original examples or cited from other sources.

1.2 Language Contact

Languages are in a contact situation when two or more share one space. A point of departure in every study of language contact situations is the description of the particularities of such contact. The proficiency and the usage of each speaker depend on
the individual’s acquisition history and the specific domains where the languages are used, such as at home, school or work, among many possibilities. The speakers analyzed in this dissertation have lived in intense contact, not only between English and Spanish, but also among various Spanish dialects. There are two generations of Spanish speakers taking part in this study; the first one has been experiencing the contact for more than 20 years, and the second one was born in a language contact situation and has maintained communicative fluency, oral and written, in Spanish, which is their generation’s heritage language.

There are linguistic and social aspects to explore in a contact situation. An important social factor that plays a significant role in determining language use in a contact situation is the speaker’s attitude towards the languages in contact. Baker (1992), although he did not discuss attitude in the context of language contact, argues that language attitudes can have both instrumental and integrative value which affects speakers’ disposition and orientation towards the languages they use. In the first case, instrumental value reflects, in his words, “pragmatic and utilitarian motives” (31). The speaker maintains a heritage language or learns a second language because it is seen as an advantage in the workplace and it results in status, achievement or personal success. On the other hand, the integrative value of language attitudes involves social and interpersonal relations. People with an integrative attitude towards using, maintaining or learning a language may be fulfilling the need of affiliation with a certain group. This differentiation becomes important when considering the degree of heritage language maintenance in a situation of contact. Development of such integrative or instrumental attitudes towards languages originates from within the particular speech communities to
which the speakers belong, including language use among family members. School environments usually help shape an individual’s attitude, depending on language policies and the positive or negative value that is given to certain varieties within the languages in use. Baker (1992) also argues that other factors such as sex, age and ideologies regarding the need for, or status of, a particular variety play an important role in shaping language attitudes and language choice. In sum, both individual and group factors affect the person’s predisposition to maintain or shift between languages.

Myers-Scotton (2002) presents an overview of the reasons for language contact that relate to this current project. She defines language contact situation as a cycle that begins when monolingual speakers’ interactions prompt them to learn a second language or when children are born into a situation where they must learn two languages simultaneously. First and second languages interact at various levels of input and within specific social domains which makes it difficult to determine the exact proficiency of a bilingual individual in the two languages. These degrees of competence and usage also determine the possible outcome of the language contact, i.e. maintenance or shift between L1 and L2. Meyers-Scotton (2002) discusses further how in situations of contact, languages are not treated equally at the social level and they often serve as tools to establish power or to maintain privilege. She refers to this situation as elite closure, where policy makers, politicians, governmental administrators, educators and other professionals decide on the official uses of the languages present in the community. In other contexts, the term could also be associated with elitism and possession of formal education, which marginalize sectors of the population from features of language in communication.
In regards to the linguistic aspect of the contact, Thomason (2000: 69) states that the most basic prediction is this: vocabulary is borrowed before structure. However, she adds that as the intensity of the contact increases, the kinds of borrowed features increase until finally all aspects of a language’s structure are susceptible to borrowing. The focus is placed on the degrees to which features are integrated into the linguistic system. Some structural features are easier to converge than others, and in regards to possessive expression, there are some structural parallels between English and Spanish that allow possessive adjectives to be used in Spanish in a way that is similar to English, albeit with a slightly different semantic emphasis. Example (1a-b) presents the use of the possessive adjective, “my”, in English in contrast to the use of the article in Spanish.

(1a) I have my homework ready.

English with possession reading

(1b) Tengo la tarea hecha.

Spanish with specificity or possession reading

In English, the possessive marker is obligatory next to any type of noun in order to establish a clear possessor/possessum link (1a). In contrast Spanish allows the use of the article to specify the object that could, or not, be in a possessive link to the subject (1b).
The opposite is shown in (1c-d) below where Spanish uses the possessive adjective and English uses the article.

(1c) I have the homework ready.

   English with specificity reading

(1d) Tengo mi tarea hecha.

   Spanish with possession clarification reading

The functionality of the article in English relies on specificity and it does not necessarily imply possession as shown in example (1c). This utterance presents an ambiguous possession reading in English: I have “the homework” ready to give to my students, not necessarily mine. The use of the possessive adjective in Spanish as in example (1d) is providing clarification to the possessive link; it becomes the subject’s homework and not any other.

Examples (1) above introduce another dimension of possession and this is the incorporation of a possessive verb “to have” tener. As it will be developed in chapter two, the verb tener in Spanish performs less semantic functionality compared to English, constraining it basically to possession in most cases and modality implying obligation in others. The use of a possessive adjective next to “to have” in English is common since the verb by itself does not clarify the possessive link, requiring the possessive adjective to
do so, example (1a). In contrast, the verb tener in Spanish does clarify the possessive link and in some contexts the possessive adjective could be avoided, example (1b). The opposite, use of “to have” + article in English requires further possessive clarification (1c). This requirement becomes even more imperative when the possessum, or possessee, is not clearly an object to be intrinsically possessed by a human subject such as a body part or a family member, the possessive adjective next to tener could add clarification to the utterance (1d), and not be a case of mere redundancy. In cases where the object to be possessed is acquired by the actions of the subject the possessive adjective could be necessary to clarify this action.

Weinreich (1966: 30) discussed how some languages possess more or fewer obligatory categories than others. Therefore, the use of the possessive adjective in Spanish, although not obligatory to state possession, but clarification, may become more commonly found in Spanish varieties that are in contact with English, and precisely this is the issue under study in the quantitative analysis of this dissertation. Before going any further, it is necessary to explain how the inalienability or alienability of nouns is determinant to analyze possession. In possession, nouns are categorized in two manners: by being inalienable, naturally linked to the subject, for example body parts or members of the family, or by being acquired by the subject through particular actions, for examples cars, houses…etc. In English, the possessive adjective is obligatory with either inalienable or alienable nouns, whereas in Spanish the possessive adjective becomes redundant with inalienable nouns where the possessive link is naturally established and there is no further need to emphasize it by a possessive marker. Examples (2 a-b) present this opposition.
(2a)  *Calla la boca. versus *Calla tu boca.

(2b)  *Shut the mouth. versus Shut your mouth.

In Spanish, often the possessive marker is understood by the context of occurrence of the noun and its relationship to the subject, if this is inalienable or alienable or if there are other object pronouns that clarify the possessive relationship. However, in English the use of the possessive marker is required more often than it is in Spanish. This requirement in English leaves Spanish with an empty category where an article is placed. This category is sometimes filled by possessive adjectives in a situation of language contact. Therefore, in the case of bilingual speakers, Weinreich (1966: 33) adds that they apparently feel a need to express some categories of one system no less strongly than in the other and transfer morphemes accordingly for purposes of reinforcement. A second generation bilingual speaker may have developed a possessive system according to both languages learned, which requires a strong mark of the possessive relationship; this affects what used to be a zero possessive link in Spanish. On the one hand, example (3a) presents a common anaphoric possession marking where no article or possessive adjective is necessary to imply the possessive relationship between the subject and the object. On the other, example (3b) may be using the possessive adjective as a strategy of specification, clarification, or emphasis.
According to Thomason (2000: 66), the intensity of the contact is determined by three social circumstances: first, the amount of cultural pressure exerted by one group of speakers on another in terms of duration; second, the size of the group; third, socioeconomic dominance of one group. Linguistically, Thomason also highlights three main predictors of contact-induced change: universal markedness, the degree to which features are integrated into the linguistic system, and typological distance between the source language and the recipient language (Thomason, 2000: 76).

Markedness is understood generally as the presence versus the absence of a particular feature across human languages. The principle of markedness is important in determining the degree to which an item could be borrowed from one language into another. Constraints may appear depending on the degree of markedness that a particular feature has within a linguistic system. In English, as well as in Spanish, the absence or presence of possessive adjectives and pronouns versus definite / indefinite determiners presents a semantic distinction or a particular emphasis. Therefore, the selection of one or the other would not necessarily be interpreted in the same manner. English requires
explicit possessive expressions to establish the link between possessor and possessum, whereas in Spanish the specificity of the article may provide the possessive link.

Weinreich (1966: 30-5) discusses the borrowing of morphemes from one language into another while highlighting the context where the contact may induce change. He explains that morphemes with opaque and complex grammatical functions are less likely to be borrowed than those with a single transparent function. Another of Weinreich’s statements is that when zero morphemes occur, those tend to be replaced by overt ones and bound morphemes by free forms (33). As will be shown later, there are instances where monolingual Spanish speakers prefer an anaphoric expression of possession, usually when the possessum is inalienable. However, it may be possible that in contact with English, the possessive marker becomes explicit. An example of this is:

(4a) \textit{Tengo} \ Ø \textit{tíos en los Estados Unidos.}

I have \ Ø uncles in the United States.

(4b) “\textit{Tengo mis tíos en los Estados Unidos.}” (MJGTMMNC)

I have my uncles in the United States.

There are two readings of the above examples (4 a-b). First, they express the same semantic meaning, and adding the possessive adjective to an inalienable noun such as \textit{tíos} “uncles” is just replacing the zero morpheme [Ø] by the overt one [\textit{mis}]. Second,
this linguistic transfer could slightly change the utterance’s meaning: example (4a) may imply some people belonging to the category “uncles”, whereas example (4b) could be referring to absolutely all the people belonging to the same category. Therefore, in the absence of the article determiner [los] “the”, the possessive adjective takes the function of specificity and possession in Spanish.

Another important language contact observation by Weinreich is that allomorphic variants are likely to be leveled into a single form (1966: 42). In situations where the use of the definite or indefinite determiners does not mark the possessive relationship explicitly, or the anaphoric expression of the possessive relation may be present, as shown in examples (5a) and (6a), a single variant is leveled as the default for possessive relation. Such a variant would be the most precise way to mark possession without ambiguity and in most cases the possessive adjective is the best choice due to its clear functionality, examples (5b) and (6b).

(5a) \textit{Ella está en Ø / la casa.}

She is at Ø / the house.

(6a) \textit{Ella viene con Ø / el abuelo.}

She comes with Ø / the grandfather.

(5b) “\textit{Ella está en su casa.}” (FJOTMMYR)

She is at her house.
The degree to which features are integrated into the recipient linguistic system sheds light on what would be the possibilities for variation in the expression of possession by an English / Spanish bilingual. Winford (2003: 92) claims that the structure of morphemes and the probability of their transfer would depend on various constraints: first, syllabicity: morphemes that are independently pronounceable; second, sharpness of boundaries: morphemes that are in opposition to zero; third, unifunctionality: morphemes with a single function; fourth, categorical clarity: morphemes with a clear function and not depending on the broader environment in which they may occur; and fifth, analogical freedom: independence from other morphemes within the same system. If the above constraints are analyzed in regards to the possessive, the hypothesis is that possessive morphemes in the form of possessive adjectives may be more prone to be transferred from one language into another. However, this could be true only in cases where the typological distance between the two languages is not excessive. Possessive markers in English and Spanish both fall under the independently pronounceable morphemes category. They mark a possessive relationship in opposition to zero, have a clear function when establishing a relationship between possessor subject and possessum object, and carry analogical freedom in order to imply the possessive relation. It is necessary to clarify that the above mentioned transfer from English into Spanish is only possible when such relationship is expressed
by possessive adjectives or article determiners, which are in grammatical congruence between the two languages. Weinreich (1966: 31-46) notes that morphemes with equivalent and simple functions between the two languages are most likely to be transferred, whereas when a morpheme has a more complex grammatical functionality, the transfer is less likely to occur. The situation becomes more complex and transfer less probable when the two languages diverge considerably in the way possession is expressed. For example, there is the case of external possession in Spanish where commonly the possessive adjectives are not used, but a preposition *de*, and the possessum is leveled to the subject’s position. This, in English, translates using [*’s*], and the possessum remains at the object’s position. This construction becomes restricted to transfer since morphemes and word order diverge; therefore, transfer may not take place.

(7)  *María’s house*  La casa de María

A second example of the mentioned divergence is the case of dative and accusative pronouns used to imply and reinforce possession in Spanish as shown in (8a). The absence of an equivalent structure in English limits the possibility of transfer in cases of contact. The fact that the dative pronoun [for me] in English does not imply possession leaves the Spanish structure intact.
In Spanish in contexts of kin relationships, the dative pronoun *me* shown in (8a) establishes a possessive relation between mother and daughter; therefore, there is no need to mark “daughter” with a preceding possessive adjective and *la* could fulfill the same function. The action of falling in love is perceived as affecting not only the possessum, but the possessor as well. The possessive link is established by a kin relationship and the dative pronoun functions as reinforcement of that link. On the other hand, in English the possessive relation is not clarified or emphasized by the dative pronoun “for me”. It is necessary to mark it by an explicit use of the possessive adjective “my daughter”, and adding “for me” would only give a different reading to the utterance, example (8b). It may imply that the daughter fell in love under a mother’s request rather than just emphasizing the possessive relationship that exists between the two, as it occurs in Spanish.
Examples (7) and (8) above illustrate the possible constraints that govern transfer in situations of language contact; each involves the consideration of the typological distance between the languages in question and their own semantic strategies for expressing the possessive link. In summary as put by Winford (2003: 93-6):

First, when there is both functional and structural congruence between morphological elements, even highly bound morphemes can be transferred; second, the greater the degree of transparency of a morpheme, the greater the likelihood of its diffusion; third, the existence of gaps in the morphemic inventory of a recipient language facilitates the importation of new morphemes and functional categories from source language; fourth, the lack of a functional category in a source language may lead to loss of a similar category in a recipient language.

The discussion of language contact process is further developed by different authors, including Silva-Corvalán who refers to the concepts of simplification and overgeneralization (1995: 6). The author defines simplification as a reduction and elimination of grammatical features where the use of one form is extended to a larger number of semantic contexts; for example, the imperfect subjunctive is replaced by the use of the imperfect indicative in Spanish, and this last mood fulfills two semantic categories. On the other hand, the term overgeneralization implies the more extensive use of a form than would be expected, for example the excessive use of subject pronouns in Spanish where those are not necessarily required. In both cases, the notion of
expansion exists. Therefore, the semantic functionality of the imperfect indicative and the
presence of the subject pronouns are expanded; however, the difference is that in
simplification there is a contraction of a competing form, whereas in overgeneralization
such a form might not exist, or be uncommon, and becomes incorporated from one
language into the other not by means of competition, but addition. Silva-Corvalán (1995:
9) concludes that:

[… ] even under conditions of intense contact and strong cultural pressure,
speakers of the receding language simplify or overgeneralize grammatical rules
but do not introduce elements which would cause radical changes in the structure
of the language. Rather these changes occur step-by step in real time and across
the proficiency continuum in the receding language.

Silva-Corvalán (1995: 10) describes the language contact outcomes that occur in
bilinguals as a communicative strategy to lighten the cognitive load of having two
linguistic systems interacting; therefore, simplification becomes a natural process that
eases communication and overall learning. The resulting changes would correlate with
the speaker’s level of bilingual proficiency and with extra - linguistic factors such as
attitudes, input, and normative pressures from standard varieties.

However, external processes such as language contact are not solely responsible
for language change. Internal evolutions within a particular language may also generate
language change. Kroch (1989) analyzes some examples that illustrate how the course of
syntactic change is constrained, or not, according to the contexts where it appears. When
the new form appears often in favorable contexts, then the change is most likely to occur. For example: favorable contexts for the possessive are those seen in attributive possession where the replacement of the definite article before inalienable or alienable nouns presents a light semantic variation leading to redundancy or emphasis. This change may be accelerated in that context. However, in predicative possession contexts where the possibility exists for verbs other than “to have” to express possession, then the speed of the change in course may be slower and depends more on the vocabulary proficiency of the Spanish speaker. In addition, the verb “to have” presents a more complex grammatical functionality in English, as mentioned above and developed further in chapter two; therefore, exact transfer is less likely to occur.

Nevertheless, the presence of several factors that could help predict the possibility of language contact did not prevent Thomason from stating that contact-induced language change is unpredictable because speakers are unpredictable (2001: 85). Therefore, each transfer generated by language contact must be analyzed while taking into consideration the complexity of social and linguistic contexts.

In the current section, I have covered the basic principles for understanding language contact and language change due to internal and external pressures. Now, the discussion moves forward to present specific studies on Spanish in contact with English in the United States which relate directly to the main topic of the current dissertation.
1.3 Spanish in the United States

A point of departure for understanding the work accomplished on the Spanish language in the United States is to review the initial scholarly interests and how they were shaped by the historical junctures of the country.

Torres (1991: 264) presents a review of theoretical and methodological issues regarding the study of Spanish in the U.S. She states that before the 1970s, most studies were basically diachronic, descriptive and concerned with phonetics, morpho-syntax and the lexicon. Variationist sociolinguistic studies of Spanish started to appear in the late 1970s. Several studies of Spanish in the U.S. have focused on the linguistic phenomena of interference and change because of the contact with English. Torres (1991) also reported that there have been studies that looked at variation within the different Spanish dialects brought by Hispanic immigrants into the U.S. A result of this dialect and language contact is presented in other studies that focused on the varieties developed by Spanish speakers who are immigrants in the U.S. An example is Elías-Olivares (1995), who describes a Mexican speech community in Chicago particularly in the context of social networks.

In addition to language variability due to demographics and immigration patterns of Spanish speaking populations in the U.S., Silva-Corvalán (2001) explains how the fact that Spanish does not have official status in the United States allows, even more, for such language variability, and that speakers use Spanish according to their individual histories and particular socio-cultural contexts, which often present contact among various Spanish dialects in addition to English.
As Silva-Corvalán (1989, 2001, and 2003) argues in her description of Spanish in the United States, the term Cyclic Bilingualism becomes important in order to understand the language contact that involves second generation Spanish speakers. The transmission of competence in Spanish depends on the input received and overall use of Spanish, both at home and within the community. A result is a continuum of Spanish proficiency revealing different degrees of competence by U.S. Spanish heritage speakers. Although population density and close contact with Spanish speaking countries provide a great environment for maintenance, the degree of acculturation to the dominant culture and language, income, education, and profession all play important roles in language contact and the outcomes present in second generation speakers.

Silva-Corvalán (2004: 218) describes how second generations are found to simplify grammatical categories, transfer forms or meanings from English, regularize forms, develop phrasal constructions to replace morphologically complex words with inflectional endings, and switch frequently between the two languages. The outcome of this language contact generates major changes within the Spanish language due to incomplete acquisition. For example, the verbal system is simplified retaining only three simple indicative tenses (present, preterit, imperfect) which also replace the use of the subjunctive, and maintain only the periphrastic form of the future tense. In her argument of grammatical simplification, Silva-Corvalán (2003, 2007) analyzed whether the process of simplification present in second generations is due to imperfect learning or incomplete acquisition in early years of life, or if it is a result of the processes of attrition or loss of acquired knowledge of the underused language. She explains how children who have been exposed to English and Spanish from birth may experience different degrees of
input from parents within a limited set of sociolinguistic contexts that result in a reduced input of particular grammatical forms that might never become developed fully.

In later research, Silva-Corvalán (2008: 216) explains the limits of convergence in language contact. She argues that even in situations of intense contact and limited exposure to the heritage language, second and third generation speakers retain typological features foreign to English. The author supports the idea that transfer from one language into another occurs at the lexical and pragmatic level, but not at the syntactic level. Speakers transfer lexical items and pragmatic uses that later develop into concrete syntactic changes. In her previous research, she demonstrated how the Spanish spoken in the southwest has been influenced by its preferential use of English parallel structures. She particularly considers the cases for null elements and word order.

Researchers are challenged by the complexity in defining proficiencies in the second generation of Spanish speakers. There are many factors that affect such definitions, and what has been generally agreed on is that bilingual second generation speakers present a heterogeneous knowledge of the different aspects of language depending on input and contexts where they have the opportunity to use the language of their heritage.

García and Cuevas (1995) studied bilingual proficiency and the possible maintenance of Spanish in the case of second generation Puerto Ricans born in New York City. Their results highlight the importance of social and community support for the use of Spanish as a direct motivation for language ability.

Otheguy and Lapidus (2000) analyzed loanwords adapted from English into Spanish and stated the necessity of extending the concept of simplification to linguistic
and social adaptation. They explain adaptation as a cognitive saving with little communicative or social alteration. The survival and transfer of some grammatical structures between languages in contact depend on their communicative and cognitive functionality. The speaker reduces the cognitive effort only in those aspects where the communicative function becomes more productive if the interlocutor is bilingual. Therefore, their main point is that lexico-structural transfers are supported by the communicative intention, which adapts linguistically and socially to specific contexts and speakers.

Jagendorf and Otheguy (1992) explored the functionality of determiners accompanying common nouns in general Spanish and how those become “naked” (87), not accompanied by a determiner, in the case of intense contact between English and Spanish in New York City. Example (7a) is one used in their analysis and which was extracted from public advertisements. “Combat” is the name of a product for roaches.

(7a) “Combat es lo más efectivo contra [Ø] cucarachas.”

Combat is the best against [Ø] roaches. (1992: 90)

[Their example and translation]

Jagendorf and Otheguy presented another aspect of the use of determiners in contact varieties, which seem to be happening in New York City. It is possible that changes such as the one described here where the article is omitted (7a), in comparison to
the Spanish general pattern (7b), increase the use of possessive adjectives (7c). [My examples and translations]

(7b)   \[Combat es lo más efectivo contra las cucarachas.\]
        Combat is the most effective against the roaches.

(7c)   \[Combat es lo más efectivo contra sus cucarachas.\]
        Combat is the most effective against your roaches.

The process of a noun becoming bare leaves an empty category in place of the definite determiner that could be easily fulfilled by the possessive adjective. The authors argue that New York Spanish uses bare nouns more often than other varieties of Spanish where there is no contact with English. However, a displacement is not observed, the two constructions coexists. In their own words “while the diffusion of the new construction appears to be growing into a language change, it has not displaced the general Spanish pattern” (Jagendorf and Otheguy, 1992: 101). Although their work did not look at the construction using possessive adjectives, and that work is still limited in U.S. Spanish research; this dissertation proposes a closer look at this type of construction where the possessive adjective may be used in place of the article. Other studies that become relevant to this dissertation are related to the early acquisition of determiners by bilingual children. Maratsos (1974, 1979), Baauw (2001), and Wolford
(2006) studied the usage of determiners: definite, indefinite and possessive adjectives in the speech of bilingual children. These studies are relevant to the current analysis because they shed some light on how children develop and interpret the use of determiners in early language acquisition. Definitions of determiners are based on the contextual relationship between the speakers’ and the listeners’ knowledge of their referents. Definite determiners denote class members familiar to both speaker and listener, whereas indefinite determiners do not refer to specific nouns already known to the speaker or the listener. While acquiring language, children need to process referential and contextual information in order to discriminate between the use of one or the other. According to Maratsos (1979) the early use of pronouns and determiners appear in the child’s first two word combinations, and the first phrases to appear are those that imply quantity and possession: “more cereal” versus “my cereal” (1979: 230). These findings are important to the current study with regard to analyzing the results of possessive usage among second generations participants and the effect of their parents’ input, societal language support, and cognitive processes made early in life while dealing with two languages and two types of listeners. Second generation Spanish speaking children growing up in an English speaking community must learn gender distinction determinants in Spanish, but not in English; however, this is not the most difficult task since usually the nouns are given to the child with the appropriate gendered determiner. The difficulty lies in situations in which English does not require definite determiners in front of its nouns and Spanish usually requires definite determiners to accompany most nouns. Maratsos (1974: 447) explains how the proper use of the definite reference in English requires that the speaker take into account the knowledge of his listener as well
as his own knowledge; however, when the reference is specific for the speaker but not for the listener’s point of view, the indefinite is required. Therefore, proper use of the articles depends on a high degree of semantic and conceptual competence. In the process of acquisition, Maratsos found that children often make “egocentric errors” in using the determinants. The concept of familiarity is not fully developed among 3 and 4 year olds, consequently their assumption is that whatever is familiar for them is for others as well.

Last, and also important, are those studies that narrate historical periods related to the presence of Spanish in the U.S. and how researchers became interested in aspects of societal bilingualism and language ideologies. Lipski (2000) presents a chronological review of the status of the Spanish language in the U.S. since the 19th century. The author narrates how Spanish has co-existed with English within the same communities resulting in language ideologies and perceptions of Spanish degradation by its contact with English (8). In addition, Fishman (1966, 1991, and 2004) also discusses how the presence of Spanish in the U.S. has been officially restricted throughout history using educational and administrative institutions.

Zentella (2004: 184) describes how historically, Spanish has been present in the voices of mostly powerless people and how this changed after the 1960s, as the immigration patterns integrated a variety of social classes and educational levels. Lipski (2000) highlights the intersection of sociology, linguistics, and quantitative analysis as the most important aspect for sociolinguistic research (11). Scholars have begun to study language variation and contact and have developed a vast and innovative field of research that differs from previous prescriptive language studies. Research methods changed and scholars physically entered the barrios to take notes, record and observe language in use;
Fishman (1971) in particular exemplifies this kind of work within the Puerto Rican community. The existence of a bilingual continuum, the presence of code switching, and the diverse proficiency levels among various Spanish speaking generations were some of the findings brought by the new sociolinguistic approach.

Next, the following chapter deals with the description of research on the possessive expression from a within a formal approach. It is necessary to discuss the theoretical background for the analysis of possession with the spontaneous speech collected for the current dissertation. The chapter begins with basic definitions of the possession relationship and the concepts of inalienability and alienability. It follows with the linguistic constructions within attributive and predicative possession expressions with original examples from the current data. Chapter two concludes with a comparison of both possessive expressions, in English and Spanish, and the constraints that govern this category within each language.
Chapter 2: The Expression of Possession
2.1. The Expression of Possession

In the current study, I will analyze the use of definite and indefinite determiners in inalienable and alienable nominal possession focusing on semantic and syntactic constraints. I will also look into predicative possession by analyzing the semantic extension of the verb *tener* “to have”. In this respect, to my knowledge, the current study will be the first to analyze predicative possession of Spanish in contact with English in the U.S. The following theoretical framework will present various aspects of possession in English and Spanish, which will explain the selection of the variants described in chapter three. First, I present the grammatical notions of possession, the inalienability and alienability relationships between possessors and possessums; second, I explain the attributive and predicative constructions of the possessive utterance; third, I continue with the significance of external possession in Spanish, following with the different possessive schemas in order to understand predicative possession, leading to an analysis of the uses of the verb *tener* in Spanish and later a comparison between both languages. The chapter concludes with a description of the possible outcomes for the possessive expression in a language contact situation.

Possessive expression is a conceptual relationship between two entities, and with some variation, it is present in all languages. Heine (1997) describes two basic requirements that define the possessive relation: “control”, which involves the ability of a possessor to manipulate the possessum; and “contiguity of location or spatial proximity between the two entities in the possessive link.” (3) The relationship between these two entities varies according to the type of agents involved. The possessed agents are categorized in two
groups: inalienable which include human beings, their family members, and body parts and alienable which are all acquired material belongings.

Some features are important when defining the way possessive relations are expressed in a particular language, and the possessive relationship not only depends on grammatical components, but also on the semantics intrinsic to each utterance used and its sociolinguistic contexts. For example, these agents could be concrete, intellectual or emotional, and the possessive relationship varies among languages when agents are inanimate or animate. Another aspect of possession is the duration of such possessive contact and if it is permanent or temporary. Some languages make important distinctions for the analysis of possession depending on human versus non-human possessors. (Heine, 1997)

All of the above characteristics serve to distinguish between the two main conceptual categories of the possessive relationship: alienability vs. inalienability. Heine (1997) defines inalienability as an intimate, inherent, inseparable relation, while alienability as a non-intimate, accidental, acquired, or transferable link. However, these two categories do not have universal properties. Inalienability differs among languages and, as Heine (1997: 11) puts it, depends on culture-specific conventions: “in some languages concepts like ‘neighbor’, ‘house’, ‘bed’, ‘fire’, ‘clothes’, or ‘spear’ belong to the inalienable category, while in other languages they do not.” Heine (1997: 155) also states that the possessor does not necessarily refer to the possessum as an item to be possessed, but also as a “quality or property of the possessum.” For example, one might say: “he has no feelings” meaning that his personality is cold, which means that he treats others harshly; therefore, the message relates to a quality of a person rather than to
possession. This example, from Heine, presents the possessum as a result of a human process; people may possess qualities that are consequences of social behaviors and interactions, biological states or inherited personality traits, and those, depending on the specific language, could be also expressed as part of the possessive grammatical category. In Spanish, these kinds of utterances are common using the verb tener, for example: él tiene rabia “he is angry”, él tiene sueño “he is sleepy”, él tiene ganas de un café “he has the desire for / wants a coffee”, él tiene éxito “he is successful”, whereas in English the same utterances are expressed commonly using the verb “to be”. This distinction between the verbs “to have” and “to be” marks a difference in expressing possession versus existence between English and Spanish.

2.1.1 Linguistic Constructions of the Possessive Expression

There are basically two types of linguistic constructions when it comes to the possessive. First are those that take the form of nominal possession, also called attributive, and second are those that are expressed through verbs referred to as predicative possession.

The distinction between these two types of constructions, attributive and predicative, not only stems from the nominal versus the verbal form, but is also apparent in the semantics of their constructions. As mentioned by Heine (1997), the use of one construction over the other depends on the proximity between the possessor and the possessum, on the length of time involved “minimal or enduring”, and finally the aspect of control “minimal or full” by the possessor on the possessum, all of which affect the selected construction (Heine, 1997: 26). Another difference made by Heine underlines
the premise that attributive possession implies a more general idea of a relationship; for example “my car” could be referring to any car that at a particular moment is driven by the possessor, but the phrase does not provide any more insight into such a relationship. On the other hand, a predicative possession is more specific in the sense that the same example could lead to a more detailed understanding of the possessive relationship as the following examples may show: “I own a car, the car that I drive, I have a car that I rented from […]” (Heine, 1997: 28). Examples (1a-b) illustrate the possessive relationship involved in specification of predicative constructions, and also the generalization of the attributive.

(1a) “Hasta para tú montarte en tu carro e ir a tu trabajo tiene que tener regla.” (BLUOYD)

Even for you to be able to get in your car, and go to your job, you need to follow rules.

Car and job are preceded by the possessive adjectives that generalize the concept of the possessive relation, meaning that there is no further link beyond the subject, the car and the job than being in possessive relation to each other. However, a more specific predicative construction would involve verbs such as those in (1b):
To sum up, and as explained by Heine (1997: 143), there are three main differences between attributive and predicative possession. First, “attributive presents presupposed rather than asserted information”; second, “it involves object-like, time-stable contents rather than event-like contents” which are properties of the predicative; third, the attributive possession “presents phrasal syntax rather than clausal.”

In the current dissertation, I analyze three types of attributive possessive constructions and base the quantitative analysis on pairs selected based on the inalienability of the noun involved. In the case of attributive possession, the focus is on the use of the possessive adjective versus that of the definite determiner with inalienable or alienable nouns, examples (2a-b) and (3a-b).

**Attributive with Definite Determiner + Inalienable Noun (AI)**

(2a)  
*Una vez *el hijo mayor *le dijo.*

Once the older son told her.

**Attributive with Possessive Adjective + Inalienable Noun (PAI)**

(2b)  
*“Una vez* su hijo mayor *le dijo.” (PEWCNE)*

Once her older son told her.
Attributive with Definite Determiner + Alienable Noun (AA)

(3a)  *Ella iba a la escuela en Manhattan.*

    She used to go to the school in Manhattan.

Attributive with Possessive Adjective + Alienable Noun (PAA)

(3b)  “*Ella iba a su escuela en Manhattan.*” (SLUOND)

    She used to go to her school in Manhattan.

The last form of the attributive category considered in the quantitative analysis of the current study is the use of the stressed possessive adjective. This last one is not observed in comparison with any other construction, but as it occurs over the entire data. This analysis has the purpose of determining frequencies across the two generations of Spanish speakers. Example (4) shows the use of stressed possessive adjectives in attributive possession.

Attributive with Stressed Possessive Adjective + Inalienable or Alienable noun (SPA)

(4)  “*Lo pongo de ejemplo con el último niño mío.*” (PEWCNE)

    I used him as an example with my youngest child.
In the case of the predicative possession, this dissertation looks in detail at the use of the verb “to have” compared with any other verb that could imply possession as well and could be used instead of it, regardless of the inalienability of the noun. Examples (5), (6), and (7) present some token samples considered in the analysis.

**Predicative with Possessive Verb *Tener* “To Have”**

(5) “*Ella tiene acento que a ella no le gusta.*” (FJOTLMNC)

She has an accent that she doesn’t like.

**Predicative with Possessive Verb *Pertenecer* “To Belong”**

(6) “*Ella pertenecía al programa de ESL.*” (PEWCNE)

She belonged to the ESL program.

**Predicative with Possessive Verb *Coger* “To Take/ To Get”**

(7) “*Las diferentes clases de trabajo que uno puede coger.*” (SLUCND)

The different kinds of jobs that one can get.

The last predicative possessive construction analyzed is the case that includes accusative and dative object pronouns in order to imply a possessive relationship. This construction, as seen in (8), is analyzed quantitatively in the data.
Predicative with Dative Possessive Relationship and Accusative Possessive Element

(8) “Para octubre ya me la tenían en la escuela.” (PEWCNE)

(Dative: mother and daughter; Accusative: school)

By October, they already had her in school for me.

All the above examples will be further examined throughout the chapter.

2.1.2 External Possession

External possession (EP) occurs when the determinant accompanying the possessum noun is unmarked. This means that possessive adjectives are not used to mark the possessive relationship, but definite articles are used instead in a prepositional phrase; in this case this expression could result in the possessor being nominative, accusative, or dative as shown in (9). The examples below imply an unmarked possessive relationship between parents and children (inalienable), and school and children (alienable), without using specific possessive markers such as the possessive adjectives: su familia (9a), mis hijos (9b), or su escuela (9c).

(9a) La familia de él

La familia de él
[Def Det + Nominal Possessum + PP + Possessor]

* The family of him

His family
(9b) “Pues entonces los primeros hijos aprenden español.” (SEUONE)

Pues entonces los primeros hijos aprenden
[ Conj + Def Det + Adj + NomPossessum+ Verb +

español
Acc]
So, then the older children learn Spanish.

The possessor “parents” is unmarked.

(9c) “Ya cuando ella comenzó a ir a la escuela fue donde ella se me fue olvidando un poquito el español.” (BEWOYC)

Ya cuando ella comenzó a ir a la escuela
[Adv Phrase + Possessum Subject + V Phrase + Def Det + AccNom

fue donde ella se me fue olvidando
+ Verb + loc + Possessum + Dative Implicit Posessor + Verb Phrase

un poquito el español
+ Adv + Acc]

When she started going to school, there she began to forget Spanish a little bit for me.

The possessor “mother” is unmarked.

Baron and Herslund (2001: 16), define external possession (EP) as something in between predicative and attributive possession:

The external possessive construction shares with predicative possession the feature that the possessive link is between possessor and possessum is conveyed by a verb; but it shares with attributive possession the feature that the possessive
link is not asserted by a verb, but presupposed. The effect in the external
construction is thus a promotion of the Possessor, which instead of being realised
as a dependent of the Possessum becomes a primary clause member, cf. the label
‘possessor ascension’.

The typical EP found in Spanish is a characteristic of inalienable possession either
referring to body parts or kinship. Franco & Landa (2002: 149) present examples of EP,
explaining that the expression of EP requires “the hypothesis of argument (AGR)” and
functions to formalize the distribution of the data present in sentences where the definite
determinant acts as the unmarked possessive determinant. They believe that an
“Agreement Binding Condition on Possession” is necessary to understand the relation
between possessums and possessors in statements where those are unmarked: kinship or
body parts.

(10) “La hija me amanecía con las manitos llenas de llagas.” (SLUOND)

La                      hija
[Def Det + Nom (possessum/Dative) +
    me           amanecía
Dat clitic (implied possessor mother) +   Verb

    con            las
    + Prep (commitative Companion Schema) + Def Det +

    manitos       llenas         de llagas
Nom (possessum/Accusative) + Adj + Prep Phrase]

My daughter used to wake up with her hands full of ulcers.
Franco and Landa mentioned how external possession structures with possessum subjects in Spanish correlate with a frequent occurrence of post-verbal subjects (2002: 149). The grammatical structure presents a verb + subject order and the clitics mark the external possession relationship:

\[(11) \quad \text{“Le amanecían los piecitos llenos de agua.”} \quad \text{(SLUOND)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Le} & \text{amanecían} & \text{los} & \text{piecitos} \\
\text{[CL.Dat3s (implicit possessor) + Verb + Def Det + Possessum]} & \text{llenos} & \text{de agua} & \\
\text{+ Adj + Pre Phrase]} & \\
\end{array}
\]

In the morning, her little feet were full of water (or swollen).

Baron and Herslund (2001: 16) discussed two constraints involving EP. First they state that in EP the relation between possessor and possessum needs to be a “part-whole relation” as is present in an inalienable possessive relation. The second constraint “is that the verb must be dynamic”; however, this varies cross-linguistically as verbs may have different functionalities within diverse contexts and languages. The combination of the above two conditions, part of a whole and verb dynamism, results in that the possessor, as a primary clause member, becomes affected by whatever the action implied is doing to the possessum. Example (12a) shows such a relationship; it is my example although based on various similar possessive utterances found in Baron and Herslund (2001).
Las ganas de mostrar su valentía terminaron en la pierna rota.

*The desire to show his braveness ended up with the broken leg.*

Accurate translation:

The desire to show his braveness resulted in a broken leg.

The example shows how the part-whole relationship between leg and the subject is based on lexical content, and, therefore, there is no need for the possessive determiner to mark the possessum la pierna “the leg”; the implied possessor “he, she” becomes affected by the action realized on the possessum “leg”. On the other hand, if the order is altered, we also see a change in possession marking:

La pierna rota terminó las ganas de mostrar su valentía.

*The broken leg ended his desire to show his braveness.*

Accurate translation:

A broken leg ended his desire to show his braveness.

Through this syntactic transformation, the possessum becomes the subject of the clause and affects another possessum (the object) in this case alienable (his desire to show his braveness). The possessor “he/she” remains implicit and the only direct reference to this third person possessor is the possessive marked determiner su describing
“braveness”; however, in Spanish a choice for an unmarked determiner in that context would easily have the same semantic connotations due to the lexical contents of the terms used, and the terms *valentía* and *pierna* relate to human beings.

(12c) *La pierna rota terminó las ganas de mostrar la valentía.*

*The broken leg ended the desire to show the braveness.*

Accurate translation:

A broken leg ended his desire to show his braveness.

(12d) *Las ganas de mostrar la valentía terminaron en la pierna rota.*

*The desire to show the braveness ended up with the broken leg.*

Accurate translation:

His desire to show his braveness resulted in a broken leg.

Another important choice for EP constructions concerns kinship relationship as shown in (13). These EP constructions are more common when the kinship relationship is acquired by marriage than when it is a direct blood kinship. In this case, speakers preferred to use the EP construction in order to place some kinship distance between themselves and the possessors of the utterances.
More examples that add to the properties of denoting such relationships with marked or unmarked possession syntax is when ex-wives referred to their ex-husbands when talking about their children. Divorced participants, within the current study, never referred to their ex-spouses as: *mi ex-marido* or *mi ex-mujer*, but as the parents of their children using external possession, as illustrated in (14) and (15).

(14)  *El papá de él*

*The father of him

Accurate translation: his father

In reference to the speaker’s ex-husband and father of her child

(15a)  *“Ella hablaba con el papá en español.”* (SEUFNC)

*She used to talk with the dad in Spanish.

Accurate translation:

She used to talk with her dad in Spanish.
The use of the determiner instead of the possessive adjective is denoting kinship distance between one of the referents (mother) and the anchor (father), which does not necessarily generate the same distance with the other referent (daughter) since Spanish allows the definite determiner to be used with inalienable kinship terms. An opposite example in this case where the mother referent implies a close kin relation would be:

(15b)  *Ella hablaba con mi ex-marido en español.*

She used to talk to *my ex-husband* in Spanish.

However, example (15b) generates ambiguity of the kin relationship between daughter and father; the ex-husband could have been the stepfather, not blood related, to the daughter. In order to resolve such ambiguity, the speaker might express it as follows:

(15c)  “*Ella hablaba español con su papá.*” (SEUCNH)

She used to speak Spanish with *her father*.

The possessive adjective is marking the kinship relationship with the daughter and keeping the kin distance between father and mother. In example (15c), the couple can still be married, but kin possessive emphasis is placed between daughter and father and
not husband and wife. If the couple were not divorced perhaps the preference would be the attributive possessive expression *mi esposo* “my husband” which implies the possessive relation between husband and wife.

It is important to mention Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm’s (2001) work on kinship grammar in order to provide further explanation of the EP usage. The authors depart from two individuals’ kin relationship where one is the referent and the other one is the anchor: “My dad is working”. “Dad” is the referent, and “I” is the anchor. In this blood kin relationship, one can say as well: “Dad is working” and the utterance is understood. Therefore, the anchor may be explicit or implicit. However, in languages such as Spanish the kinship nouns must be of a personal type: “dad” *papá* or *papi* in order to allow an implicit relationship between anchor and referent: “father is working” does not imply the direct kin bond if it is not explicitly marked by the possessive adjective: “my father is working” due to the universality of the term “father” in comparison to the semantic personal specification of the term “dad” or *papi*. In data from the current study, the term *papi* was often used by Puerto Rican participants to refer to the father without marking the possessive relationship through grammar. Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm’s argument of a kin term resembling a proper name is present (2001: 24). The following are examples from current data:

(16) “*Ella vivía con papi arriba.*” (BLWOYR)

She lived with *daddy* upstairs.
There is not an obligatory possessor marking in Spanish when referring to inalienable nouns of the body-part kinds. Spanish standard syntax does not necessarily present token samples like (17) below:

(17)  Se golpeó su pierna.

He/She hit his/her leg.

Obligatory possessor marking has developed as a result of a grammaticalization process, described by Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001: 211) as: “A process by which possessive pronouns come to be used whenever possible rather than when communicatively motivated. The frequent use of pronouns in communicatively redundant positions facilitates their reduction to affixes.” While this has not been the case in Spanish to the degree that the possessive adjective becomes an affix, the purpose of the current study is to discover the degree to which possessive adjectives might be used redundantly with those kinds of inalienable nouns when they are not necessarily required. Moreover, the analysis leads to the idea that such apparent redundancy is generating a new function of the possessive marker in order to clarify possessive relationship or emphasize possession.¹
2.1.3 Possession Schemas and the Predicative Constructions

With regard to predicative constructions using the verb *tener* “to have”, emphasis on the possessor is evident. The predicative construction uses a verb which expresses information about the ownership experienced by the possessor, placing the possessum as an object in the relationship:

(18a) "Nosotros **tuvimos un apartamento en Parson.**" (SEUFNG)

We had an apartment in Parson.

On the other hand, “belong” constructions, using the verb *ser* “to be”, place the importance in the possessum:

(18b) *El apartamento de Parson era nuestro.*

The apartment in Parson was ours.

The distinction between these two kinds of constructions is pragmatically motivated rather than syntactically. Verbs implying possession are selected by the speaker according to “schemas” that provide meaning for the relationship between possessor and possessum (Heine, 1997: 45-7). In order to understand this motivation, the
predicative possessive notion functions according to eight propositional structures called “schemas” which involve agents, patients, and conditions present between the two as proposed by Heine. ii

First, the action schema involves some kind of action or activity; the verb tener “to have” results from “semantic bleaching”, a concept that relates to verbs that imply possession such as “get”, “take”, “grab”, and “obtain”, in the process of transforming to the common use of “to have” (Heine, 1997: 47)

(19) *El niño tiene hambre.

The boy did not get any food; therefore…

* The boy has hunger.

Accurate translation:

The boy is hungry.

Second, there is a locative copula that places the existence of the possessum at the location of the possessor. Therefore the possessor acts as a locative complement and the possessum as the subject (Heine, 1997: 51).
(20)  *Tenemos invitados.*
We have guests.
(We have guests at our place; therefore they belong to us in their capacity as guest.)

The third manifestation of this possessive relationship is present by the condition of companionship: the possessor is with the possessum (Heine, 1997: 53).

(21)  *Tenía yo muchos amigos.*
I used to have many friends.
(The friends were with me; therefore, they belonged to me in their capacity as friends.)

Fourth, within the genitive schema the possessum exists in reference to the possessor and can be expressed by using attributive morphology in addition to the verb. In English it is common to find this type of schema in constructions like (22a), whereas Spanish commonly favors the definite article *la* rather than the possessive adjective as in (22b).
(22a) I have my homework.

(22b) *Tengo la tarea.*

I have the homework.

Fifth, the goal schema presents a relationship of benefactive existence “for”; the possessum exists for the possessor. In this type of relationship, there is a dative/benefactive or goal case expression involved. Kempchinsky (1992 b: 698) presents a detailed explanation of this type of possessive dative construction where the link between the possessive interpretation of the dative and the benefactive semantic roles is crucial:

The interpretation of the dative clitic as a possessor of the direct object corresponds to a specific underlying syntactic structure, in which an empty category, [e], is construed as the possessor, via modification.

In Spanish, it is common to find this type of schema providing the accusative/dative case markers that are present in its grammar, for example:
In example (23), the empty category refers to the mother “possessor” talking about the daughter “possessum”. There are two indirect object pronouns me and le, this signifies that the action is affecting two people and the link between the two derives from the kin possessive relationship.

Sixth, there is the topic schema defined as the case where the possessor exists as a topic or theme, as described by Heine (1997: 62). The topicalized constituent acquires properties of a subject and the resulting statement provides the notion of two existent subjects. The characteristics of this type of schema are humans acting as possessors, possession involving kinship terms as in (24a), and possessums appearing as culturally formed concepts as in (24b). Examples from the current data leading to this type of schema are:
(24a) "Ella tiene más hermanas en Colombia." (BEWOYC)

She has more sisters in Colombia.

(24b) "Ellos no tienen prejuicios." (SEWCYA)

They do not have prejudices.

Seventh, the source schema is a notion of the possessum being originated and coming from the possessor; it usually uses markers that denote this notion of existence originated at some place: “from”, “of”, “out of”, and in Spanish de. This type of schema is mainly present in Spanish in attributive possession in the form of “external” relation as in (25a), or part of a whole “source” as in (25b). The prepositional element de common in romance languages has the ablative or source function.

(25a) "El americano no es el idioma de nosotros." (SLUCND)

* The American is not the language of us.

American is not our language.

(25b) "Esto es un país de inmigrantes." (SLUCND)

This is a country of immigrants.
And last, Heine describes the equation schema that deals with the concept of identity; it does not involve a conceptual shift, meaning that the source is essentially the same as its target, and that this type of schema usually results in “belong” constructions.

(26a)  “El país es de Paula.” (BEWOYC)
*The country is Paula’s.
It is Paula’s country.

(26b)  El país es suyo. (de Paula)
The country is hers.

In Spanish, it is common to find this type of construction using stressed possessive adjectives such as mío, suyo, nuestro, which leads to a strategy for emphasis. These possessive markers are in post nominal position and do not replace the noun.

(27)  “Amistades mías que no hablaban inglés.” (SLUCND)
Friends of mine that did not speak English.
Table 1 Possession Schemas (based on Heine 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action Schema</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location Schema</strong></th>
<th><strong>Companion Schema</strong></th>
<th><strong>Genitive Schema</strong></th>
<th><strong>Goal Schema</strong></th>
<th><strong>Topic Schema</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source Schema</strong></th>
<th><strong>Equation Schema</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>El niño tiene hambre.</em></td>
<td><em>Tenemos invitados en casa.</em></td>
<td><em>Tenía yo muchas fallas.</em></td>
<td><em>Tengo la tarea.</em></td>
<td><em>Me le enseñaban su español.</em></td>
<td><em>Ella tiene más hermanas en Colombia.</em> <em>Ellos no tienen prejuicios.</em></td>
<td><em>El americano no es el idioma de nosotros.</em> <em>Esto es un país de inmigrantes.</em></td>
<td><em>El país es suyo.</em> <em>(de Paula)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The boy is hungry. (The boy did not get/have any food.)</td>
<td>We have guests at home.</td>
<td>I used to have many faults.</td>
<td>I have my homework.</td>
<td>They taught her Spanish for me.</td>
<td>She has more sisters in Colombia. They do not have prejudices.</td>
<td>American is not our language. This is a country of immigrants.</td>
<td><em>The country is hers. It is Paula’s country.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Expression of Possession in Spanish and English

The expression of possession, although it shares some similarities between both languages, presents some differences that need to be explored. Both languages differ in their use of possessive adjectives versus the articles. In Spanish, there exist the following possessive adjectives:
Table 2 Possessive Adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive Adjective</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi/mis</td>
<td>My</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu/tus (informal)</td>
<td>Your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su/sus (second person formal and plural in Latin America)</td>
<td>Your, his, her, their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuestra/o/s</td>
<td>Our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuestra/o/s (informal plural Spain)</td>
<td>Your</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English marks the possessive relationship explicitly by using possessive adjectives, whereas Spanish can also imply it through the use of other syntactic and semantic features within the sentence using the article:

**Expletive**

(28a) *El niño vive con la abuela.*

The child lives with the/la grandmother.

**Denoting**

(28b) *El niño vive con su abuela.*

The child lives with his/la grandmother.
In example (28a) the determiner *la* “the” is defined as “expletive” by Baauw (2001: 83), who argues that it is different from *su* “his” in example (28b), which is defined as a denoting determiner. The difference is discussed as “empty categories” existing in romance languages where definite articles appear to be semantically empty in some syntactic contexts and are therefore expletive determiners (Weinreich, 1966; Winford, 2003). On the other hand, English uses definite determiners in order to denote familiarity with the referent. These denoting and expletive features of the determinant alter the use and understanding of possessive relations. Children vary in the manner they acquire two languages simultaneously, and this incongruence between Spanish and English might present an additional challenge for bilingual children who need to discriminate between the usages of the determinants with possessive value in both languages. In (28a-b) above, the definite and the possessive determiner are accomplishing the same function: denoting an inalienable noun, whereas the English equivalents carry a more expletive feature and the possessive adjective is required to add a more denoting function. Example (28a) could generate ambiguity in English discourse, but not in Spanish.

Wolford (2006) conducted a study that focuses specifically on the use of possessive expressions among Spanish/English bilingual children. Focusing on speech produced in English, the author makes an important distinction among participants: those who learned how to read and write in Spanish first, “Latino Spanish children”, and those who became literate in English first, but were always exposed to Spanish discourse at home, “Latino English children”. The features analyzed were third person possessives
“his-her”, attribute “-‘s” possessives and periphrastic “of” possessives. Some of the examples she discussed are reproduced in (29).

(29a) “…like when I go to my cousin [sic] house”. (2006: 1)

(29b) “…and the friend of my brother brought it back”. (2006: 1)

(29c) “His [sic] name is Jacqueline”. (2006: 5)

Wolford found a greater dependence on the periphrastic form as shown in example (29b), rather than on the attribute possession expressed through “-‘s” as shown in example (29a). This occurred among both Latino Spanish and Latino English speakers. She concluded that learning to read in Spanish clearly contributes to a preference for the periphrastic form. Another important conclusion reached by Wolford is the lack of gender agreement between the possessive adjective and the noun, as shown in example (29c).

In addition to Wolford (2006), another study that covered the expression of possession in U.S. Spanish is the one by Orozco (2004). The latter focuses on the expression of nominal possession by studying the alternation among possessive adjectives, definite articles, and possessive periphrases. Orozco studied Colombians in New York City and compared them with a Colombian-based speakers group from
Barranquilla. His findings reveal that possessive adjectives occur more frequently in Colombian Spanish and rank second in New York Spanish among Colombians, while the occurrence of determiners is stable in both varieties. On the other hand, the possessive periphrasis is almost twice as high in New York than in Barranquilla. He also argues that the form that is traditionally associated with correctness, the possessive adjective, occurs less frequently in New York than in Barranquilla. In Orozco’s study internal linguistic criteria consisted of clause length, type of subject, location of the possessive grammatical person and number of the possessor, adjectives in the marked noun phrase (NP), distance between referent and possessive, grammatical gender of the possessum, and semantic category of the possessed noun. He states that all these factors reached statistical significance in both groups. The external factors that reached significance were the speaker’s sex and the combined effect of socioeconomic status and age. The author signaled the high use of possessive adjectives in both Spanish varieties and recognized that the definite article used in possessive context is widely used as well, showing that English interference might not have an evident impact on the overall use of the definite article to mark possession. Orozco does not argue that a change is in progress in the expression of possession in New York Spanish and leaves the question open for future research.

2.2.1 Possession in Spanish

Possession in Spanish is expressed through attributive and predicative constructions. The attributive form consists in an unmarked pre nominal possessive adjective in a reduced form preceding the noun: mi “my”, su “his/her/your”, nuestro/a/s
“our”, *vuestra/s* “your plural”; or a marked post nominal stressed possessive adjective: *mío* “mine”, *tuyo* “yours”, *suyo* “hers, his, theirs, yours formal”, *nuestro/a/s* “our”, *vuestra* “your plural”. Also, the possessive could be implied by an article determiner: *el, la, los, las* “the”, if the noun is inalienable and the relationship between possessor and possessum is implied. Other forms of attributive possession are constructed through external possession as discussed above.

The possessive determiner, as explained by Antrim (2002: 1-7), states the possessive relationship within the noun phrase and provides value to an argument. In the case of the possessive presented as a marked post-nominal stressed possessive adjective (*mío, suyo*), the argument value is emphatic and the pre-nominal determiner becomes an article as illustrated in (30).

(30)  “*El idioma mio*” (SLUONC)

*The language of mine

Accurate translation: My language

The article could be present as either definite or indefinite as shown in (31a-b).

(31)  a. “*Un hermano mio*” (BEUFYE)

  A brother of mine
b. “El hermano mío” (SLUONC)

The brother of mine

There is a difference in meaning between both utterances. This is marked by the plurality implied by the indefinite article (31a), meaning that the subject has more than one brother, and the singularity of the definite article (31b), by which the subject is referring to a particular and only one brother.

In the evolution of the possessive from Latin into Spanish, the possessive determiner lost its gender specification and became reduced to su “her, his, their”, and “your” formal. However, vuestro “your” plural, and nuestro “our” maintained plural and gender markers. Due to the ambiguity in the case of the third person singular and plural su, the intended meaning must be inferred from the context, not the linguistic form.

Spanish expresses the attributive possession externally through the use of the preposition de “of”. This helps in the clarification of the possessive determiner: su casa -> la casa de ella, la casa de él, la casa de ellos, la casa de usted y la casa de ustedes “her house”, “his house”, “their house”, “your house” (plural and singular). Orozco refers to the use of de in possessive expressions as “possessive periphrases” (2004: 193). It is clear in his work that such external possession is accompanied by a nominal determiner, either feminine or masculine, and not by a possessive adjective as shown below, with example (32a) being the unmarked option among monolingual Spanish speakers using the standard variety, and (32b) found among certain Spanish dialects.
(32)  

a. *La casa de él*  

*The house of him*  

Accurate translation: His house

b. *Su casa de él*  

*His house of him*  

Accurate translation: His house

Hnat (2008: 58) provides examples of this type (32b) referring to them as the redundant *su* used mostly in the central region of Mexico. The author adds that the form is stereotyped as a linguistic feature of people with low educational level. In her research, she argues that the form dates from early times of the Spanish language; however, it has persisted as a common variant in those regions where Spanish is in close contact with indigenous languages and she cites specifically Mexico and Perú. Uriagereka (2000: 409) analyses the role of the possessive adjective and the EP construction within the same sentences as a case for a distinction between the alienable from the inalienable reading. The following are my examples:
Tokens such as those in (33a-b) may present different readings depending on the context. At first, one can notice the purpose of the emphasis in regards to the inalienability or alienability condition of the noun *herencia*. This noun could refer to those genetic characteristics passed onto someone by parents, or it could be those material or cultural belongings passed from the first generation to the second. The definite determiner could possibly lead to a reading of alienability, whereas the possessive adjective in its reinforced pragmatic function is adding semantic inalienability. Therefore, (33b) could be interpreted as physical or personality traits permanently inalienable to her and inherited by blood kinship. The inheritance is a “part of a whole” possession relationship. This reading may not be applied in all cases and within different dialects, but it could be a possibility for a marked used of possessive adjective versus article determiner.

In Spanish, there is another important aspect to consider in regards to possession, which is the role clitics play in a benefactive reading involving inalienable nouns as discussed by Kempchinsky (1992 a). As is explained below by the examples and analysis, accusative and dative pronouns are placed in the utterance establishing a relationship between subject and object that reveals mutual effect by actions and
inalienable possession. Data collected from first generation Spanish speakers, where the content referred constantly to inalienable possessums such as daughters, sons, grandchildren, mothers and fathers, presented token samples such as the following:

(34) “La niña me faltaba mucho a la escuela.” (SLUOND)

*The girl, for me, she missed school a lot.

(Talking about mother and daughter)

Accurate translation:

My daughter missed a lot of school days.

(35) “Me lo cuidaban.” (SEUONS)

For me, they took care of him.

(Talking about mother and son)

(36) “Amistades que me la podían sacar de control.” (SEUONS)

Friends that could take her out of control, from me.

(Talking about mother and daughter)

According to Kempchinsky, the examples above relate to what is called the “ethical dative” or “speaker clitic” (1992 b: 699). The author states that this clitic
appears only in the first or second person, cannot be doubled in standard Spanish, and must co-occur with dative clitic, either reflexive (37) or non-reflexive (38).

(37)  \textit{Te me bañas ya mismo.}

\textit{Te me bañas ya mismo}
\hspace{1cm} \text{[Reflex 2nd Person + Dative Clitic + Verb + Time Adverb]}

You bathe yourself right now, for me.

(38a)  \textit{Me le enseñaban el español.}

\textit{Me le enseñaban el español}
\hspace{1cm} \text{[DAT Clitic Possessor + DAT Clitic Possessum + Verb + Acc]}

Accurate translation:

They taught my daughter Spanish for me.

In Example (38a), the mother is the implicit speaker possessor represented by the dative clitic \textit{me} “me” and the daughter is the possessum represented by the dative clitic \textit{le} “her”. A similar construction is present in the current data, including an additional possessive adjective marker. The same example is analyzed in the “goal schema” above, (23), and reproduced in (38b).
Silva-Corvalán and Gutiérrez (1993) made another classification within the role of clitics: “the affective clitic” as the presence of an object pronoun, not necessary, but with the intention of involving the interlocutor in the speaker’s action as in example (39). It is explained as a strategy to highlight the participation of the person who listens to the statement, in the action expressed by the verb about the speaker.

(39) “Yo todos los días te corro 5 millas.”

I run 5 miles every day for you. (1993: 214)

The possessive dative construction seems to be a property of transitive verbs where some object is being affected by the action. Kempchinsky claims the benefactive/malefactive interpretation of the dative clitic forms by the chain between the
clitic and an “empty category” (1992 a: 139-43). This concept is accepted and exemplified by Mallen (1999: 454) as well, and the following are his examples:

(40) “Adam le vio las bragas a Eva.” (1999: 454)

[VP [ Adam le vio] DP [las bragas a Eva]]

* Adam her saw the panties of Eve.

Accurate translation:

Adam saw Eve’s underwear.

In example (40), Mallen states that “the chain linking the clitic le and the empty category las accounts for the possessor relation between the dative clitic and the noun phrase in complement position” (1999: 454). Adding to this clitic function of conceptualization, Uriagereka (2000: 421) argues that “the clitic is only a determiner introducing a complex integral relation, composed of a given mental space and a particular presentation of that space, through some sort of classification.” This argument is exemplified in (41a) from a second generation speaker in the current study data.

(41) a. “Ella me tomaba la leche.” (FJOTLENA)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Ella & me & tomaba & la leche \\
[Sub pronoun + Ind Obj pro (Dative) + Verb + Direct Obj (Accusative)] \\
* She, from me, drank the milk.
\end{array}
\]
Accurate translation:

She drank my milk.

In (41a) the dative clitic me is acting with possessive properties over the “milk”; therefore it has a double function: benefactive and possessive. This frees the selection of a definite determiner to accompany “milk”, la leche, since other links between possessor and possessum have been already implied. Uriagereka (2000: 421) states that “the raised clitic delimits particular events by moving to corresponding V sites.” (41b-c) exemplify Uriagereka’s last argument.

(41)  

b. *Se me la tomaba. to the left: upper voice

c. *Tomábasemela. to the right: lower voice

Examples (41a) and (41b) are more common in vernacular Spanish, whereas (41c) is ungrammatical in Spanish. The interesting fact about (41b) is that the upper voice, clitics to the left, places the verb at a higher degree of importance in the statement, the act of drinking the milk, whereas in (41c) the lower voice, clitics to the right, becomes associated more to the milk being drunk for me by him or her.
2.2.2 The Use of the Verb *tener* “to have” in Spanish

With regard to the predicative expression of possession, the verb *tener* “to have” is a multifunctional verb that not only implies possession in its explicit manner, but is also part of a whole relationship between subject and object, and in another sense, the object provides semantic features for the subject. Baron and Herslund (2001: 86) describe the verb “to have” as representing local relationships depending on the semantic link between object and subject and explain this denotative inclusion in three manners. The following are my examples:

a) The object plays a role in a part-whole relationship:

(42) *La casa tiene muchas ventanas.*

The house has many windows.

b) The object denotes part of the subject noun’s possessions:

(43) *Mi madre tiene una casa.*

My mother has a house.

c) The object constitutes one of the semantic features of the subject noun:

(44) *El país tiene muchos inmigrantes.*

The country has many immigrants.
The verb *tener* “to have” is used in fixed constructions involving inanimate concepts, as well as alienable and inalienable relationships between possessors and possessums as shown below:

(45) For age (inanimate inalienable possession):

\[Tengo 30 \text{ años}.
\]

*I have 30 years.

Accurate translation:

I am 30 years old.

(46) For temporary condition (inanimate alienable possession):

\[Tengo \text{ hambre}
\]

*I have hunger.

Accurate translation:

I am hungry.

(47) For conditions that are abstract, inanimate and alienable:

\[Tengo \text{ miedo}.
\]

*I have fear.

Accurate translation:

I am scared or I feel fear.
The verb *tener* has also been discussed in terms of relational nouns implying dependency and non-relational nouns targeting independence (Arnaiz and Belvin, 1996). Arnaiz and Belvin classify nouns according to the control that the possessor might have to cancel the relationship with the possessums and analyze the complement noun as it expresses an event or state that place the subject, the possessor, as an experiencer. The dependent noun acting as the possessum requires a relationship to the possessor for its definition, whereas the independent noun does not require another entity for its definition. This concept leads us to inalienable versus alienable properties of the nouns in place. Examples of inalienable dependent nouns and alienable independent nouns are shown in the current data in examples (48), (49) and (50), (51) respectively:

(48) “*Tengo dos hermanas aquí en los Estados Unidos.*” (SLUONC)

I have two sisters here in the United States.

The sisters are the possessum and relate to the possessor in order to exist. There are not “sisters” if a possessor subject were not there to create the possessive link. This presents an inalienable relationship.

(49) “*El mayor tiene un acento.*” (PEWCNE)

The oldest one has an accent.
The accent needs to be experienced by someone who is present during a person’s speech. The relationship between accent and speaker is considered inalienable, since although an accent could be modified, it is a permanent characteristic of any individual who belongs to any particular speech community.

(50) “*Ella tiene una responsabilidad bien grande.*” (BEWOYC)

She has a huge responsibility.

The responsibility could come to an end; therefore, the relationship is alienable.

(51) “*La escuela tuvo un programa.*” (PEWCNE)

The school had a program.

The program is not necessarily part of the school requirements, and such a relationship is alienable.
Table 3 The Use of the Verb *Tener* (based on Heine 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-whole relation</th>
<th><em>La casa tiene muchas ventanas</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s possessions</td>
<td><em>Mi madre tiene una casa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate inalienable possession</td>
<td><em>Tengo 30 años</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate alienable possession</td>
<td><em>Tengo hambre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract, inanimate and alienable</td>
<td><em>Tengo miedo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inalienable dependent</td>
<td><em>Tengo dos hermanas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienable independent</td>
<td><em>La escuela tiene un programa</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3 Spanish Possessives in Comparison with the English Possessives

Perez-Leroux, Schmitt and Munn (2002: 200-2) compare English and Spanish in their uses of inalienable nouns with determiners and argue that different constraints apply in both languages. One important constraint in English is the use of definite articles for inalienable construal where it would use an internal possessive determiner.

(52)  *Juan *(se) lavó la cara.* (2002: 200)

*John washed the face.*

Accurate translation:

John washed *his face.*
In (52) the Spanish example takes the dative/benefactive argument through the use of the reflexive pronoun *se* and establishes the inalienable relationship between the possessor *Juan* and the possessum *cara* “face”. Therefore, in Spanish there is no need to use the possessive adjective determiner *su* “his”.

Another constraint in Spanish relates to the number of the inalienable possessums denoting body parts. They must be singular regardless of the plurality of the possessor, as in example (53a); unless the body part is naturally plural to an individual as in (54a).

**Singular in Spanish**

(53)  


*John and Maria raised the head.*

b. *Juan y María levantaron las cabezas.*

John and Maria raised their heads.

**Plural in Spanish**

(54)  


*John and Maria raised the hands.*

Accurate translation:

John y Maria raised their hands.
Singular in Spanish

b. Juan y María levantaron la mano.

*John and Maria raised the hand.

Accurate Translation:

John and Maria raised their hands.

However, Perez-Leroux, Schmitt and Munn (2002: 202) claim that inalienable constructions in English with definite determiners appears productive in locative prepositional phrases such as example (55) and (56), and the singular number restriction seems to apply in both languages in this case.

Singular body part

(55) We hit them on the head/ *the heads. (2002: 202)

Les golpeamos la cabeza/ *las cabezas.

Plural body part

(56) We hit them in the eye / the eyes. (2002:202)

Les golpeamos el ojo/ los ojos.
The article by Perez-Leroux et al. analyzes the possessive expression focusing on the cognitive process that children experience when learning language, and they infer that:

The English child is predicted to have stages of development where the interpretations of the definite with inalienable possession nouns run contrary to their experience (e.g., the -> IC in D.O. contexts). The Spanish child will retain the option of IC for the definite but the English child will have to restrict it. The Spanish child will have to learn that IC may be restricted by number, or by lexical class of verb, but otherwise remains fine with definite determiners. (2002: 202)

This idea in regards to the acquisition of possessive functions by English and Spanish monolingual children differs from what could be the case for children who grow up bilingual and receive constant input in both languages. A question may be formulated about how bilingual language acquisition modifies possessive expression constraints, resulting in possible interference between the grammars where semantics would have little alteration and possessives and determiners could compete for the same position. One example of this possible interference is (57).

\[(57) \text{ “Me escucho en mi cabeza el acento.” (FJOTLMNC) \}
I hear the accent myself in my head.
Cabeza “head” is an inalienable body part that requires a definite determiner *la* in Spanish instead of a possessive one *mi*, whereas in English, it could act as an internal construal, “my head”. This internal construal, common in English, becomes extended to other linguistic contexts in Spanish as shown in (58a) as opposed to (58b).

(58)  

a. “*Le meto esa idea en su cabeza.*” (BEUFNE)  

I put that idea in his head.

b. *Le meto esa idea en la cabeza.*

* to him, I put that idea in *the* head.

Accurate translation:

I put that idea in his head.

This language contact situation leads to a semantic competition between the possessive and the definite determiners. Perez-Leroux, et al. suggest that “the form with most content features would always win, or the language specific form would always win over the universal default” (2002: 203). In contact situations between English and Spanish, a need for semantic clarification emerges in the Spanish inalienable construal since the influence of English motivates the usage of the possessive, available in the Spanish grammar, over the definite article, which is the default form in monolingual
Spanish. Example (59) illustrates the possible result of English and Spanish contact in regards to the possessive expression:

(59) “...y eso siempre estaba en mi mente.” (FSOTLMYR)
   …and that was always in my mind.

Examples (60) and (61) occur using the definite determiner as is common in Spanish monolinguals, but not in English monolinguals.

(60) “Mi mamá no me dejaba pintar las uñas temprano.” (FFOCMMND)
   *My mother didn’t allow me to paint the nails early.

(61) “…como que se la pasa por la nariz.” (MJGTMMNC)
   * ...like (he) passes it through the nose.

Furthermore, observing the predicative constructions in both languages, the claim in the literature is that “have” is more functional than tener in Spanish (Dikken, 1997). In English, the possessor usually functions as the subject or topic of the sentence, and the possessum as the object or complement as in (62a), my example.
(62a) Sofía has the best computer.

As for the “belong” construction, it presents the opposite order, i.e., the possessum is encoded as the subject or topic and the possessor as the complement, as in (62b) and (62c), my examples.

(62b) The best computer is Sofía’s.

(62c) The best computer belongs to Sofía.

Taylor (1989b), (cited in Heine, 1997: 31) states that “belong” constructions limit the semantic extension of the possessive relation. In addition, an important feature of genitive constructions is that they leave the possessive relationship open to multiple interpretations. Example (62d) may imply a temporary relationship between the subject and the object; the computer may be borrowed, or a computer that she is using at a computer lab, or it could be her property.

(62d) Sofía’s computer.
In contrast, in example (62e) the corresponding predicative “belong” construction presents a limitation of interpretation by establishing a more intimate, permanent relation between the subject and the objects as part of its possessions.

(62e) The computer is Sofia’s.

It is important here to note the difference between ownership and existence that possessive expressions may represent. According to Baron and Herslund, in French the situation is as follows (2001: 85):

The difference has to do with the fact that with avoir the expression of the possessor has passed from the status of object of a locative preposition to that of subject of the sentence: it denotes the entity about which the sentence is asserted. In other words we consider the notion of ‘possession’ to have its origins in the primitive notion of existence.

The above concept could be exemplified in Spanish as follows:

(63) “Los hijos tienen muchas oportunidades.” (BEUFYE)

The children have many opportunities.
The possessive relationship departs from the concept that the opportunities exist: *hay oportunidades* “there are opportunities”, then it develops into location: *hay oportunidades en los Estados Unidos* “there are opportunities in the United States”, which changes later into belonging: *las oportunidades son de los hijos* “the opportunities are of the children (theirs)” and finally into ownership: *los hijos tienen muchas oportunidades* “the children have many opportunities.”

In order to compare the uses of the verb “to have” in English and Spanish, it is necessary to refer to the multifunctional role of this verb in English as described by Heine (1997: 34-5). There are seven main notions of possession as shown below, and (64) through (70) are my examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Notions of Possession (based on Heine 1997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical possession: (64) I have my papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary possession: (65) I have a book from the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent possession: (66) I have the house inherited from my parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inalienable possession: (67) She has Latin features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract possession: (68) They have a cold relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate inalienable possession: (69) He has a strong accent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate alienable possession: (70) She has a lot of Hispanic customs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The functionality of the verb “to have” is also explored by Ritter and Rosen (1997: 296-308) who state that all uses of “to have” also include causative, experience,
and location readings and an auxiliary role. Such readings become important as they expand on the seven possessive notions where the relationship between possessors and possessums is basically limited to ownership. Examples (71-75) below present the functionality of the verb “to have” in English, and translations into Spanish provide the possibilities of the same functions in the Spanish language:

Causative

(71a) Mrs. Lopez had her children studying French during high school.

La Señora López tuvo a sus hijos estudiando francés durante la secundaria.

There is more to highlight in regards to the causative reading of the verb “to have” in Spanish. Example (71a) above is grammatically accurate in Spanish; however, such causative functionality could be found in sentences using the verb hacer “to make/to do” like (71b). The verb hacer performs the same causative reading in Spanish or English.

(71b) La señora López hizo que sus/los hijos estudiaran francés en la secundaria.

Mrs Lopez made her children study French during high school.
Nominal event

(72) Mrs. Lopez had lunch with the teachers.

La señora López tuvo un almuerzo con los maestros.

Location

(73) Mrs. Lopez has a red dress on.

La señora López tiene un vestido rojo puesto.

Examples (71), (72), and (73) present parallel functionality between the two languages, but there is a variation necessary to comment on in example (72). In spite of the possibility of using a periphrastic construction with the verb tener -> tener un almuerzo it is also possible to use the verb almorzar as the main verb and avoid tener: la señora almorzó con los maestros, focusing on the action and not on the nominal event.

Experiencer

(74) Mrs. Lopez had her house sold.

*La señora López tuvo su casa vendida.

In example (74), the verb tener lacks the same functionality in Spanish due to the difference in passive constructions between the two languages. Spanish expresses the
same passive syntax by its use of the impersonal *se: se vendió la casa de la señora López*, or by pseudo passives: *le vendieron la casa a la señora López*. In this case, it is necessary to refer to external possession in order to establish the possessive relationship between the house and Mrs. Lopez, which in English is done by the verb “to have” along with the passive construction. As a result, the example shows how the verb “to have” is limited in Spanish to the experience reading.

**Auxiliary**

(75) Mrs. Lopez has studied English.

*La señora López tiene estudiado inglés.*

Accurate translation: *La señora López ha estudiado inglés.*

Lastly, in example (75), there is a case of auxiliary usage where Spanish lacks the functionality of *tener* as an auxiliary verb and instead uses *haber*: *La señora ha estudiado inglés*. In this utterance, neither the verb “to have”, or the verb *haber*, establish a possessive link between Mrs. Lopez and the English language. However, it is possible to find in Spanish the following: *La señora tiene estudiado el / su inglés*. In this example, the verb is part of a passive construction that emphasizes the completed action by a subject, focusing on the object “English” as the main piece of information of the statement. The article determiner or the possessive determiner is required at the object’s position. The selection of one or the other adds to the possessive relationship between
Mrs. Lopez and her knowledge of the English language. If the article determiner is used, *la señora Lopéz tiene estudiado el inglés*, the verb *tener* is emphasizing the completed action, and possession is understood as her accomplishment. On the other hand, if the possessive adjective is used, *la señora Lopéz tiene estudiado su inglés*, the possessive determiner, in addition to the verb *tener*, places importance at the object’s position, “English”, making it part of her possessions after a succeeded action, studying it. Moreover, Spanish allows for a benefactive dative construction, which is more common, where the verb *tener* is replaced by the reflexive *se*: *la señora López se estudió el /su inglés*. In this kind of construction, the focus is placed on the action done by the subject for one’s self. The selection that the speaker might make between the possessive or article determiner becomes a matter of interpretation in regards to the possessive relationship with the object: Mrs Lopez and her English, a language that she might consider to be part of her possessions after having studied it for herself.

The examples above, according to Ritter and Rosen (1997: 296), show how the verb “to have” lacks lexically specified semantics and acquires interpretation from the syntax, more specifically from the relationship between the subject and the predicate.

Furthermore, differences between *tener* and “to have” in both languages direct the discussion into the possibilities of other verbs taking over the role of “to have” in English when the same meaning is implied in Spanish. Castillo (1998) explains how the verbs *tener* and *haber* represent only one verb, to have, in English in perfective constructions as well as possessive verb selection as in (76) and (77):
Then, Castillo parallels the verb “to have” to its equivalent in Spanish in the same circumstances where two different verbs are found:


The examples above show how the verb “to have” performs its function as an auxiliary functional head in English, whereas in Spanish such a function does not exist using tener. However, there are instances where Spanish speakers would use a similar English construction and use tener as an auxiliary as shown in (78) and (79), my examples.

(78) Te tengo dicho que no vengas sin llamar.

I have told you not to come without calling.
Tengo perdido un documento importante.

I have lost an important document.

The difference in this particular case is that such statements are not part of the perfect tenses where, semantically, the focus is placed on the time line of the action: “I have told you many times in the past and up to the present not to come” and “I have lost a paper in the recent past and it is still lost up to the present”. When tener is used as an auxiliary, as in the examples above, the semantic focus is placed on the result of a past action: “tell” or “lost”. These actions could be interpreted as experienced possessums of the type of (74) with the difference that (78) and (79) are verbal possessums while (74) is a nominal possessum.

Further, Castillo (1998:165) discusses how in Spanish the possessive function must be overt or the verb haber can be used instead. The following are examples from my data:

(80) a. “Teníamos fiestas, teníamos la música y la comida hispana.”

(FJOTMMYR)

We had parties; we had music and Hispanic food.

b. Había fiestas, había música y la comida hispana.

There were parties, music and the Hispanic food.
The verb *tener* in (80a) marks a strong possession function, whereas the verb *haber*, (80b), in the same case refers to the mere existence of the parties and not the relationship between the possessor “we” and the possessum “parties”, “music”, and “food”.

The functionality of the verbs *tener* and *haber* in Spanish becomes complex as Mallen (1999: 453) discusses the relation between the locative “there is/are” *haber* and possessive “to have” *tener* to argue that: “when the locative adverb introducing existential sentences indicates a rather unspecific location, the implication of existence interpretively takes precedence. Equally, if the claim for possession is not foregrounded, then the implication of existence tends to be favored.” This preference becomes exemplified in the following example from the current data:

(81a) “Yo no entendía por qué había hispanos en esta clase.” (FJOTMMYR)

I did not understand why there were Hispanics in that class.

Here, the implication of existence prevails over possession since it is not clarified that there is a possessive relationship between the subject “I” and the location “class” preventing the object “Hispanics” from being a possessum element of the subject as may be implied in (81b) below:
Yo no entendía porque tenía hispanos en esa clase.

I did not understand why I had Hispanics in that class.

The second example (81b) specifically shows a possessive relationship between the subject “I” and the location “class”. Since the class belonged to the subject, therefore the existence of Hispanics acquires the status of a possessed element.

In order to understand the idea of the functions for haber versus tener in Spanish grammar, this study intends to look in detail at tokens where the two verbs can be used interchangeably in grammatical terms, but a semantic change is inferred. vi

Adding to the analysis of the semantics of “to have” tener and “there is/are” haber sentences, Belvin and Dikken (1997: 156) present a structurally parallel reading in English, between the verbs “to have” and “there is/are”. They explain this parallel reading according to what they call “the propositional specification clause subjects.” Belvin and Dikken provide the following examples:


In sentences like (82a) where the verb “to have” indicates a subject as an experiencer, there is a verbal clause “walk into my office” which describes the existence of an event “a strange man walking into my office” in a possessive “have” construction. On the other hand, if the sentence is introduced by the existential “there” like in example (82b), the parallelism extends to the fact that this sentence as well can propose a specification clause reading: “the event of a strange man walking into my office was there (i.e. existed, happened, took place)” (1997: 156). The same analysis of a parallel reading in Spanish results in a different grammatical outcome. A literal translation of (82a) in example (82c) is ungrammatical in Spanish.

(82c) * Tuve un hombre extraño caminando hacia mi oficina.

In example (82c), the verb tener cannot imply experience for the subject “I” in Spanish. More than a subject’s experience, it is perceived as an event happening at a certain office that belongs to me which makes the existent action an experience for the subject. Therefore, Spanish syntax prefers constructions like (82b) that use haber and prioritize existence over experience, as translated in (82d):

(82d) Había un hombre extraño caminando hacia mi oficina.
Moreover, Baron and Herslund (2001: 10) present an important distinction within the predicative possession between “to have” and “to belong” constructions. Although other authors claim that “have” constructions are more “polysemous” and “belong” constructions are more restricted to the concept of “ownership”, their argument is in favor of the idea that the verb “belong” is not restricted to expressing ownership. In order to test the relevance of this argument for the Spanish counterpart, it is necessary to analyze the verb *pertenecer* “to belong” in Spanish as either having locative or possessive meaning. Examples (83) and (84) present the distinction.

**Locative Meaning**

(83)  
*El niño pertenecía al programa de ESL.*

The boy belonged (is part of) to the ESL program.

**Possessive / Ownership Meaning**

(84)  
*Ese programa le pertenece a la escuela.*

That program belongs to (is property of) the school.

Moreover, continuing with the analysis of expressing possession in Spanish and English, there is in English a kind of commitative pattern involving the preposition “with” which may be used to encode attributive possession: “The man with a red nose” and predicative possession: “She is with child” (Heine, 1997: 27). Analyzing this same
possessive expression, Seiler (2001: 32) classifies it as a N:N, noun class/case/exist noun, in his scale of transition between the possessor and the possessum in their inherent or established relationship. This type of commitative pattern is perceived as if it were a relationship of location involving a preposition. In English “with” is common, whereas in Spanish *de* covers the same functionality, as in (85).

(85) The man with the hat

*El hombre del sombrero*

Within the attributive possessive expression section, the differences and preferences between the definite article versus the possessive adjective before the possessum noun were presented. However, this did not take into account the presence of the verb *tener* prior to the definite / indefinite *el, la, un, una* determiner or the possessive determiner *mi, su, tu* as shown in the examples below from the current data.

(86) “*Creo que ella tiene su masters.*” (FIOTLMNC)

I believe she has her Master’s.

(87) “*Él tiene sus tíos en Honduras.*” (SEUCNH)

He has his uncles and aunts in Honduras.
Español-Echavarría (1997: 241) provides an explanation as to the occurrence of possessive adjectives in the post verbal tener position as a cause of inalienability versus alienability. He states that inalienable possession involves null [Ø] marking of the possessor DP by the possessum: él tiene los tíos en Honduras, whereas the same effect is absent in the case of alienable possession: ella tiene el/un masters. In the second case, with alienability, a causative reading is proposed following the work of Español-Echevarría. The fact of possessing the Master’s degree is a direct cause of the action of the possessor when used with possessive adjective: ella tiene su masters. If used with an indefinite determiner, as could be commonly found in Spanish: ella tiene un masters, the possession relationship between “she” and the degree is stated without further emphasis or reference of the possessor towards the possessum. Español-Echevarría explains this causative reading focusing on what he calls “transitory possession contexts dealing with inalienable nouns and adjectives” through his examples (88a-b).


*Juan has the nails painted.

Juan has painted nails.


Juan has his nails painted.
Example (88a) simply shows the state of Juan’s nails and (88b) Juan is understood as causing or being responsible for the state of his nails. By this comparison, Español-Echevarría (1997: 242) concludes that “causative readings obtain as a result of a control relation between the higher possessor and a PRO external argument of the adjective/participle.” The possessive adjective sus controls an empty pronominal category associated with the external argument of pintadas “painted”.

The arguments above provide an idea of the difference that occurs between English and Spanish in regards to the expression of possession either in attributive or predicative constructions. However in a situation of contact where the two languages may interact frequently, features from both languages could be present in either language altering the patterns described above. The following section presents possible outcomes within Spanish when it is in intense contact with English in regards to the expression of possession.

2.3 Expected Variation in the Expression of Possession in a Contact Situation

If interference from English into U.S. Spanish should be found, then it would fall under what Silva-Corvalán (2001) describes as “lexical-syntactic calques.” These are calques that involve one or more words which alter semantic and syntactic features. A word is reproduced from English into Spanish, and as it is stated by Silva-Corvalán (2008: 217) “The word in the receiving language may incorporate semantic components, as well as subcategorization and selectional restrictions from English, but it must originally share some semantic or pragmatic component with the corresponding element in the contact language.” The change affects the meaning of a word within a grammatical
construction in relation to others. As examples from this study’s data demonstrate, some calques that I expect to find are:

1. Kinship possession is considered inalienable and the determinant used before these nouns is the definite article *el, la* among Spanish monolingual speakers when the speech refers to a third person, as in example (89a) below. The inalienable relationship of possessor *ella* and possessum *abuela* is not required for possessive adjective determinant *su*. On the other hand when the same utterance is expressed in English, (89b) is commonly found.

(89)  

a. *Ella se pasaba la mayor parte del tiempo con la abuela.*

*She spent most of the time with the grandmother.*

b. *Ella se pasaba la mayor parte del tiempo con su abuela.*” (SLWOYR)

She spent most of the time with *her* grandmother.

I expect the possessive adjective to appear more often than the definite article, since it is common in English when expressing kinship possession in third person as in example (89b) above.
2. Body parts are considered inalienable; therefore, no possessive adjective is needed to accompany those kinds of nouns. The definite article would be the preferred form among monolingual Spanish speakers as example (90a) shows.

(90) a. “Algunas veces amanecía con los piecitos llenos de agua.” (SLUOND)

*Sometimes in the morning, the little feet were full of water (or swollen).

b. Algunas veces amanecía con sus piecitos llenos de agua.

Sometimes in the morning, her little feet were full of water (or swollen).

The prediction in this case is that the subjects of my study belonging to the second generation of speakers would use the possessive adjective more often before nouns of body parts, as example (90b) shows.

3. Alienable nouns are more commonly accompanied by possessive adjectives in English. However, in Spanish, the definite or indefinite article, or nothing, is commonly found:

(91) Este es el segundo año de universidad.
Prediction:

“Este es mi segundo año de universidad.” (FSGTMMNH)

This is my second year of college.

(92)  Le entendía bien poco a la maestra.

Prediction:

“Le entendía bien poco a mi maestra.” (FJUTLMYE)

I understood my teacher very little.

(93)  Quería salir con los/Ø amigos.

Prediction:

“Quería salir con mis amigos.” (FSUTMMNC)

I wanted to go out with my/Ø friends.

(94)  Yo cojo Ø tiempo.

Prediction:

“Yo cojo mi tiempo.” (FJUTLMYE)

I take my time.
Examples (91) through (94) predict an overuse of possessive adjectives with alienable nouns.

4. Expansion in the use of tener as a possessive verb where monolingual Spanish speakers commonly use haber if the conversational context already implies possession:

(95) a. *Yo los acompañaba cuando tenían viaje de la escuela.* (SLUOND)

I used to go with them when they had school trips.

b. *Yo los acompañaba cuando había viajes de la escuela.*

I used to go with them when there were school trips.

(96) a. “*Tengo turistas que vienen como de otros lugares.*” (FJUTLMYE)

I have tourists that come from other places.

b. *Hay turistas que vienen como de otros lugares.*

There are tourists that come from other places.

Both constructions, in English and in Spanish, can be found among monolinguals. However, the experiencer “to have” found in examples (95a) and (96a) is common in
English, and the impersonal expression using the verb *haber* for existence is common in Spanish. The prediction is that within the data, the experiencer “to have” type of possessive predicative expression will be present at higher rates.

5. Double possessive in the form of the verb *tener* + possessive adjective:

(97a) “*Cada cual tiene su costumbre de cada país.*” (SLUONC)

Everyone has *their* costume from each country.

In monolingual Spanish speakers, the verb *tener* is commonly followed by the definite article (97b), or nothing (97c), and attributive external possession is demonstrated using the preposition *de*.

(97) b. *Cada cual tiene las costumbres de cada país.*

c. *Cada cual tiene Ø costumbres de cada país.*

In my data, I expect to find that the verb *tener* would be followed often by possessive adjectives incorporating a shift towards possessive redundancy or an
experiencer reading as discussed earlier in this chapter. The verb tener + possessive adjective may appear with either inalienable or alienable nouns:

(98) “Otros padres tenían sus hijos en otra escuela.” (PLWCYC)
Other parents had their children in other schools.

(99) “Cada una es diferente tiene sus cosas buenas y sus cosas malas.”
(SLUCND)
Each one is different; (it) has its bad things and its good things.

(100) “Yo tengo mi amiga que vive en Nueva York.” (FJUTLMYE)
I have my friend who lives in New York.

In summary, chapter two has presented the possibilities of the expression of possession in Spanish as well as in English as they are discussed by various researchers. Then it has described the differences and possible outcomes in situations of contact, ending with five expected variations which are quantitatively analyzed in chapter four and five and discussed in chapter six. Chapter three describes the methodology used in data collection and the approach taken in the classification of the tokens for the quantitative analysis.
Chapter 3: Methods
3.1 Introduction

The following chapter explains the process of data collection. It describes the selection of the participants, the questionnaires, and the linguistic and social variables considered. Appendixes from this chapter include first and second generation biographical information and coding, consent letters and questionnaires.

The process of data collection for this study started before the idea to focus on possessive expression. The initial approach was to collect: narratives, and personal experiences from second generation Hispanic speakers in New York while growing up bilingual. Later, my interest extended to include the same narratives from first generations of Hispanic immigrants and add to the details of raising bilingual children in the United States. The topics included descriptions of family members, household practices, and school experiences while interacting in two languages. The natural interviews allowed for authentic speech on various topics that spontaneously provided utterances using inalienable and alienable expressions of possession. However, since my initial attention was not related to the possessive expression, I did not purposely insist on any kind of construction, and there were fewer tokens of certain construction including those involving body parts. Most of the inalienable examples are about family members and most of the alienable examples relate to educational experiences.

3.2 Participants

The first interviews were recorded with second generation participants starting in 2003. Later, the invitation to participate was extended to their parents. I initiated interviews with participants from the first generation in 2005 and continued until 2007.
when I finished collecting the data for the study. My first contact with the second
generation participants was through a college Spanish course they were taking
exclusively designed for Spanish–English bilingual speakers. The course is offered
once a year by the department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at SUNY Oneonta.
The students’ proficiency level in this class varies, but all are able to communicate orally
in Spanish with fluency. At first, students register for the course with the objective of
improving their writing and reading skills in Spanish, a language they have been using
for the most part orally and within private and informal social domains. In some cases,
the students end up majoring in Spanish, after taking the course, and further advancing
their learning and usage of the language beyond private domains. Being a faculty
member in the Foreign Languages and Literatures department at the institution where the
study was carried out, I had several opportunities to teach the above mentioned class.
Also, by serving as the Spanish Club adviser, I frequently interacted with several of the
students outside the classroom, which helped the elicitation of a more informal
conversation at the time of the recorded interview. The project was approved by the
University at Albany IRB, and I established contact with the selected participants who
fulfilled the criteria of having been raised bilingual, born in the U.S. or arrived in the
country before school age. The second generation’s interviews took place at the college
and their parents were interviewed at their homes. I conducted and transcribed all the
interviews myself; 17 from the second generation and 15 from the first generation were
included.
3.2.1 Students

Data collected from second generation Spanish speakers, the students, consists of seventeen recorded semi-directed interviews. The group is composed of four males and thirteen females, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. The age group and gender composition are representative of the student population in the course. The countries of origin are: Colombia, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, Ecuador, Argentina, and Spain. Four were born in a Latin American country and were brought into the United States between the ages of four and seven. Thirteen were born in New York City and some have visited their parents’ country of origin for long periods during the summer vacations; three lived in Puerto Rico and Mexico for a couple of years during their late childhood, and a few have never been out of the U.S., but have interacted constantly with extended family and lived within mostly Hispanic neighborhoods. All participants have speaking and comprehension skills in Spanish given that, for the majority, it was the home and the community language. Literacy levels vary depending on their different home and school experiences with the Spanish language. Table 1, presents the distribution of students based on origin, gender and place of birth.
Table 1 Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of origin</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina (1)</td>
<td>United States (13)</td>
<td>Male (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia (3)</td>
<td>Hispanic country (4)</td>
<td>Female (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Parents

Fifteen interviews were conducted with first generation participants. Ten included both parents at the same time, making the total number of first generation participants twenty five. The places of origin are the same as the student participants. Table 2 reveals the distribution of parents based on origin.

Table 2 Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of origin</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Data Collection

Since most of the students were taking the Spanish for bilinguals’ class with the researcher as their professor, they were not invited to participate in the study until the completion of the course. Interviews with students were scheduled in the language laboratory in order to have an optimal quality of recording. This environment, although not natural for a conversation, was a place that the participants knew prior to the interview. Students had classes in the laboratory and were used to talking through headphones and microphones. Topics of the interview were about their experiences growing up bilingual and bicultural at home, at school, and in community settings.

A consent form and a demographic information sheet were included in the process. The demographic questionnaire contained the following information: name, age, birthplace, childhood and adolescence residence, year at college, major and academic concentration, parents’ level of education and profession, languages spoken at home with different members of the family, and the language used in their community of residence. The interview questions were divided into five main topics: 1) family, friends and community while growing up and at college, 2) school experience at elementary and secondary levels, including English as a Second Language and Bilingual classes, if taken; teachers; the process of learning both languages and using each in educational environments, 3) Spanish classes attended at high school and college, 4) general appreciation of their experience growing up bilingually and biculturally, and 5) opinions and suggestions for teachers, parents and other students who might have a similar experience.
After having interviewed several students, I became interested in the stories that their parents had to tell and asked students to invite their parents to participate in the research. Interviews with the first generation speakers were not recorded until after the interviews with their children were finished. Some students agreed to invite the researcher to their homes and talk to their parents. Students arranged the time and date of the visit to their houses. I traveled to the different boroughs of New York City, Long Island, and Westchester County where I recorded the interviews for an average duration of one hour. The interviews took place in their living rooms and sometimes at kitchen tables. Most times, I was invited to eat with the entire family after the interview, which was a source of additional information and direct observation.

As was the case for the students, the data collected from the parents consisted of a demographic form with the following information: name, age, level of education, profession and languages spoken with children, spouses, extended family and friends. The questions in the oral interview elicited a general description of their immediate family members, years living in the United States, communities of residence since arrival, and jobs held. The interview became more specific when their children became the topic. Some of the themes were parents’ involvement with the children’s teachers, school and homework, their strategies for maintaining the use of Spanish at home, and reinforcing religious education. In addition, experiences of traveling back to a Spanish speaking country with their children and contact with extended family and their children’s friends were part of the conversation. Opinions were requested in regards to the differences between the two cultures, basic values and traditions of Hispanic families and the difficulties experienced while bringing up their children in a country where they
were immigrants. It is important to highlight that these questions served for guidance only. The recorded sessions often turned into spontaneous conversations, and I used the questions only to encourage conversations, thus making the interaction less of a formal interview.

3.4 Methodology

After reaching the decision to analyze the expression of possession in the collected corpus data, tokens were extracted based on the categories described in chapter two. The current work follows the principles of “orderly heterogeneity” initially developed by Weinreich, Labov and Herzog (1968). Sociolinguists believe that language heterogeneity is not random; on the contrary it follows patterns that could be predicted by variation analysis. In order to quantify speech variation, researches use methodology that search for language patterns using theoretical principals of the quantitative paradigm. Bayley (2004: 117-120) outlined these theoretical principals and highlighted two as important: “the principle of quantitative modeling” and “the principle of multiple causes.” The former is to examine the forms of a linguistic variable and observe the contexts in which it occurs. The contexts can be linguistic, other forms that occur close to the variable under study, and social, referring to the social phenomena that co-occur with the given variable form. The latter, the principle of multiple causes, implies the existence of multiple contextual factors where the variability can be observed in natural collected speech and how it becomes unlikely that a single factor can explain the variability found. In addition to these principals, there are two other important notions relating to the individual speakers. First, a variationist analysis must consider that
individual speakers may differ in their use of the variable rule which alters the probability of their input. Second, speaker selection should share similar characteristics; individuals providing the speech samples need to belong to the same speech communities. In this dissertation, the criteria for participant selection were based on being of Hispanic origin and residing in urban New York. The second generation Spanish speakers were selected considering that all of them were brought up bilingual since early childhood and the first generation participants were their parents. Thus, I was able to carry out an intergenerational language variation analysis.

The instrument used to quantify the data became the next concern. For this purpose, I used the statistical tool, GOLDVARB X, known as VARBRUL in earlier versions, which was designed by Sankoff in 1988, and later explained in Young and Bayley (1996), Paolillo (2002) and Tagliamonte (2006). For this quantification purpose, the variable to be analyzed must be defined and its possible variants described. The question to ask is whether there are two ways of saying the same thing. After having studied the syntactic differences between attributive and predicative possession, the linguistic variables were defined and their dual variant occurrences explained. The social contexts of the utterances were also defined independently for each generation as it is further explained below. I initially started my data analysis with an earlier version of VARBRUL in 2006, which later was upgraded to the current GOLDVARB X.

3.5 The Linguistic Variables

The dependent variable is the expression of possession and its variants are all the different possibilities available in Spanish and English. Tokens are coded according to
fourteen categories of possessive expressions: seven attributives, and seven predicatives for each generation. This will provide a description of the linguistic behavior within both groups.

Table 3 presents all the attributive categories coded for both groups. Attributive variants are coded in pairs, three in total, except for one variant that is not coded comparing it to any other, and it is included in order to observe its frequency in the entire data.
Table 3 Attributive Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Attributive Variants</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective + Inalienable Noun (PAI)</td>
<td><em>Aquí uno tiene miedo de controlar sus hijos.</em>&lt;br&gt;Here, one fears controlling one’s / their own children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article + Inalienable Noun (AI)</td>
<td><em>Aquí uno tiene miedo de controlar los hijos.</em>&lt;br&gt;Here, one fears controlling the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Article + Alienable Noun (AA)</td>
<td><em>Ellas me ayudaron con la escritura cuando yo les ayudaba con la tarea.</em>&lt;br&gt;They helped me with the writing when I used to help them with the homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessive Adjective + Alienable Noun (PAA)</td>
<td><em>Ellas me ayudaron con mi escritura cuando yo les ayudaba con su tarea.</em>&lt;br&gt;They helped me with my writing when I used to help them with their homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective + Ambiguous Noun (PAamb)*</td>
<td><em>Yo quiero que mis hijos mantengan su cultura y su identidad hispana.</em>&lt;br&gt;I want my children to maintain their Hispanic culture and their identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article + Ambiguous Noun (Aamb)*</td>
<td><em>Yo quiero que los hijos mantengan la cultura y la identidad hispana.</em>&lt;br&gt;I want the children to maintain the Hispanic culture and the identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stressed Possessive Adjective (SPA)</td>
<td><em>Las dos hijas mías hablan muchas veces en inglés.</em>&lt;br&gt;The two daughters of mine talk many times in English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*tradition, language, culture, identity, and nationality*
Table 4 presents all the predicative categories coded for both groups. Predicative variants are coded in pairs, three in total, except for one variant that is not coded against any other possibility. The use of dative and accusative pronouns to imply a possessive relationship between subject and object is taken into consideration with the purpose of observing the object pronoun functionality with possessive implication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Predicative Variants</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Verb <em>tener</em> + Possessive Adjective + Inalienable Noun (<em>tener</em> + PAI)</td>
<td><em>Mucha familia Latina que tienen sus hijos aquí.</em> Many Latin families that have their children here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb <em>tener</em> + Possessive Adjective + Alienable Noun (<em>tener</em> + PAA)</td>
<td><em>Cada cultura es diferente, tiene sus cosas buenas y sus cosas malas.</em> Each culture is different; it has its bad things and its good things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Verb <em>tener</em> where <em>haber</em> is possible</td>
<td><em>Tienen más respeto hacia los padres</em> They have more respect towards the parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb <em>haber</em> where <em>tener</em> is possible</td>
<td><em>Hay más respeto hacia los padres.</em> There is more respect towards the parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Other Possessive Verbs instead of <em>tener</em></td>
<td><em>Es más fácil conseguir una droga de conseguir algún licor.</em> It is easier to get a drug than to get liquor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb <em>tener</em> instead of Other Possessive Verbs</td>
<td><em>Es más fácil tener una droga de tener algún licor.</em> It is easier to have drug, than to have some liquor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dative + Accusative; Implicit Possessive</td>
<td><em>El niño me hizo Kindergarten sin ningún problema.</em> The child did <em>Kindergarten</em> (for me) without any problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were three different token files to store in GOLDVARB, and the criteria for codification sought purposely to compare ways of expressing possession. The first token file consisted of second generation attributive and predicative variants crossed with social variables that applied to second generation speakers (gender, year in college, place in the family, place born, first and present social network, use of English at home, and origin). The second token file included first generation attributive and predicative variants crossed with their particular social variables (occupation, community of residence, English skills, education, English at home, and origin). The last token file combined the first and the second generation attributive and predicative variants crossed with the social variables that are common for both generations. These are community of residence, use of English at home, and country of origin.

### 3.6 The Social Variables

**First Generation**

**Occupation:** it was divided into three categories, professional, service employees, and business owners. The type of job held provided important information about the parents’ social network and the languages spoken on a daily basis. Professionals were few. They self-reported to be fluent in English and used it mostly at their jobs. One was a bilingual executive at a multinational company, two worked in the field of education, and another was a real estate agent in Long Island, NY. Service employees held jobs as building superintendants, cooling and heating technicians, housekeeping employees, and store clerks. This group was diverse in their social network affiliation and reported different contexts where they would use either English or Spanish. The last group, the business
owners, included participants who had a beauty salon, a cleaning service company, and a Hispanic bodega, small neighborhood store. This group made their daily transactions in Spanish since the business was located in a Hispanic community and the clientele was mostly of Hispanic origin. They self reported little use of English, except for the cleaning service owner who dealt with English speaking clientele and Spanish speaking employees.

Community of residence: it described the participant’s language interaction in their neighborhoods, if Spanish was used in local businesses and among the community, or on the contrary whether English was the common language for communication. The participants were divided almost evenly in this category. The group that resided in mostly Hispanic communities belonged to areas in the Bronx, Upper Manhattan, Queens, and Brooklyn. The other half lived in areas of Queens, Westchester and Long Island. It is important to highlight that the majority of people in this group initially resided in other communities upon arrival in the U.S., mostly lower income immigrant communities, and later moved to other neighborhoods, which according to them, were better places to raise their children.

English skills: They were categorized as advanced (fluent) or intermediate/fair (limited). This division was based on self reports. I never spoke English to the parents to obtain an idea of their fluency; however, I crossed this self reported information with the one stated in the demographic information sheet, and usually it correlated with their occupation in the U.S. Professionals were advanced in their English fluency, service employees varied between intermediate and fair, and business owners reported to have fair command of English.
The level of education: it was categorized into three groups: college education, secondary or primary schooling. Only two of the first generation participants reported to have attended high school in the U.S. Both were of Puerto Rican origin; one arrived in New York when he was seven years old, and the other was born in the U.S. The rest of the group finished their basic schooling, primary or secondary, in their countries of origin. The participants who reported to have a college education were diverse. The professionals, working in a multinational company and the educational field, completed their college degrees in their countries of origin, complementing their education with master’s degrees in the U.S. The real estate agent and the service employees stated that their college experience started in their native countries, but was never completed. Later in the U.S., they attended community colleges to learn English, and some of them went further in their education to receive some type of vocational instruction in order to obtain better jobs.

The use of English at home for communication: it is necessary to clarify whether this social variable was coded with the understanding that the societal language was allowed within the private environment for substantial communication or whether it just entered the home as single words or phrase code-switching. Ten out of the 25 first generation participants reported that they allowed English at home for daily communication. They either spoke English and Spanish to their children or accepted responses from them in English most of the time. The group that did not allow English at home was divided, first, by the ones who held strong Spanish language loyalty and recognized the importance of bilingualism for their kids. The second group consisted of those parents with limited English skills who preferred that their children communicated in Spanish
and often reported the use of Spanish to be a practice of respect, good manners with Hispanic adults, and house rules agreements.

Country of origin: Colombia, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, Ecuador, Argentina, and Spain. Table 2, above, specified the number of participants per country. The majority of the group belonged to more numerous immigrant groups in New York: Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Colombians, and Ecuadorians.

Table 5 presents the specific number of participants under each social variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Business</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of English at Home</th>
<th>Community of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No English at home</td>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes English at home</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Generation:

Gender: the group of participants was selected among Spanish majors and minors within the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Oneonta State College. Since the majority of students are female, the majority of participants are young women.

Year in college at the time of the interview: this category was important in order to consider how formal studies of Spanish might have changed their use of the possessive expression. Often those in junior and senior years of college have taken more academic courses in Spanish than the freshmen or sophomores.

Birth order in the family: the division consisted of eldest children, younger ones, or the only child. The purpose of this categorization was to correlate the outcome in the use of the possessive expression by the second generation with previous research findings in Zentella (1997), where the author commented on better command of Spanish by older children in the family.

Place of birth: the United States or a Spanish speaking country. This category is important when considering if the child learned to communicate exclusively in one language during the first years of life or if, on the contrary was always exposed to two linguistic environments through family practices, community and mass media.

First social network: when looking at social interaction, there was a need to establish a distinction between two life stages: childhood and adolescence including college years. The reason for this was to consider linguistic experiences for those who moved between neighborhoods and the influence that extended family members exercised in their lives while they were growing up. The networks are divided between mostly Latino
environments where Spanish was used for communication in public, mostly English environments, or mixed cultural and linguistic environments.

Second or current social network: this included late years in high school and their social interaction at college. Three categories were established: mostly English, mostly Spanish, and culturally and linguistically mixed social networks at the time of the interview.

English usage at home: this was based on a self report about the language they use in their interaction with parents, siblings and/or extended family residing in the same home. Participants clarified if English was used either for communication or just as single word code-switching.

Places of origin: these were the same as their parents: Colombia, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, Ecuador, Argentina and Spain.

Table 6 presents the specific number of participants in each social variable.
For the analysis, first, frequencies of the linguistic variables were calculated for both generations, and later I proceeded to cross all the linguistic variables with various combinations of the social ones. Additional results are further discussed in chapters four and five, but only those with significant weight to prove a possible change in progress between generations in regards to the expression of possession.

This chapter described the methodology used for data collection, the participants, and the variables under study. The following chapters focus on the analysis of the use of the possessive expression in each generation.
Chapter Four: Results Attributive Possession
The current chapter discusses the expression of attributive possession. First, I start by describing the quantification procedure; second, I present the distribution of each linguistic variant according to generation, and lastly, I discuss the co-variation between the linguistic variants and the external social factors in the case of each group.

The tokens selected for the analysis were included if possessive adjectives or articles could be found in syntactic competition expressing possession. Definite articles with meanings other than possession were excluded from the data. Cases of attributive possession were coded based on the noun’s alienability and the permanent or temporary relation to the speaker. Examples (1a-b) present the variation found between alienable nouns. Most of them relate to school, home, or community, as these were the topics that most often surfaced in the recordings.

(1) a. *Esto ocurrió cuando mi hermano fue primero a la escuela.*

*This happened when my brother first went to the school.*

b. **“Esto ocurrió cuando mi hermano fue primero a su escuela.”**

(MJGTLMNR)

This happened when my brother first went to his school.

Examples of inalienable nouns belong mostly to the category of family members or to body parts. As explained in the previous chapter, the natural development of the
conversation often conveyed topics that related to family interaction. However, since the data was not collected with the possessive expression as the target structure, body parts were not specifically elicited as a topic and occurred infrequently. Examples (2a-b) show the variation found with inalienable nouns.

(2)   a. “Él tenía su abuela que era judía.” (FJOTLMNC)

He had his grandmother who was Jewish.

b. Él tenía la abuela que era judía.

*He had the grandmother who was Jewish.

There were other nouns coded that presented an ambiguous inalienability reading, based on the fact that every human being intrinsically possesses them, but which could be changed, lost, or modified through life. Examples (3a-b) show one of the nouns with ambiguous reading.

(3)   a. “Ella es muy acomplejada con su acento.” (FJOTLMNC)

She is very self conscious about his accent.
b. *Ella es muy acomplejada con el acento.*

*She is very self conscious about the accent.*

The last possessive variant considered was the use of the stressed possessive adjective. Its frequency was observed throughout and not compared to any other variant with the same syntactic functionality. The objective was to analyze its occurrence and if it was a common form found in first or second generation U.S. Spanish speakers. Example (4) presents the use of the stressed possessive adjective.

(4) "Ella vivía al lado de la casa mia." (FJOTMMNG)

*She used to live next to the house of mine.*

Accurate translation:

She used to live next to door to me.

These variants shown in examples (3) and (4) above, nouns with ambiguous inalienability reading and stressed possessive adjectives were not frequent. Therefore, results could not be conclusive without more data collection in monolingual and bilingual environments. In addition, ambiguous inalienability reading requires more word analysis, in particular syntactic contexts, before coding their possessive function. Results, presented later in this chapter, include explanations about my approach to these
two variants, and how I looked at them initially for coding. However, they are not significant for the purpose of being included in the quantitative analysis.

Table 1 presents the distribution of attributive tokens from the two generations of speakers. It includes possessives with inalienable and alienable nouns, as well as nouns with an ambiguous inalienability reading, and stressed possessive adjectives. The total number of tokens was 1435 (second generation 886; first generation 549). In total, there were more occurrences of alienable nouns (868), than inalienable nouns (391). There were fewer (58) with an ambiguous inalienability reading, and stressed possessive adjectives occurred infrequently (118) when compared to the entire attributive possessive data (1435). Included in the current quantitative analysis, only the difference between the pairs one and two from table 1 is statistically significant.
### Table 1 Frequency of the Attributive Constructions per Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Attributive Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective + Inalienable Noun (PAI)</td>
<td>92 (16.8%)</td>
<td>131 (14.8%)</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article + Inalienable Noun (AI)</td>
<td>107 (19.5%)</td>
<td>61 (6.9%)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Article + Alienable Noun (AA)</td>
<td>100 (18.2%)</td>
<td>377 (42.6%)</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessive Adjective + Alienable Noun (PAA)</td>
<td>152 (27.7%)</td>
<td>239 (27%)</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective + Ambiguous Noun (PAamb)</td>
<td>15 (2.7%)</td>
<td>21 (2.4%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article + Ambiguous Noun (Aamb)</td>
<td>11 (2%)</td>
<td>11 (1.2%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stressed Possessive Adjective (SPA)</td>
<td>72 (13.1%)</td>
<td>46 (5.2%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inalienable nouns used with first person possession, plural or singular, were included if parallelism between the article and the possessive adjective was possible and it resulted in two ways of saying the same thing. For example, (5a) presents a case where an inalienable noun could be accompanied by an article determiner for specificity rather than stated possession in Spanish, while in English this use of the article determiner is ungrammatical and the redundant possessive is necessary (5b).
(5)  a. Íbamos siempre donde la abuela.

*We used to go always to the grandmother’s.

b. Íbamos siempre donde nuestra/mi abuela.

We used to go always to our/my grandmother’s.

The utterance (5a) above allows for an article to imply the possessive relationship in Spanish because the inalienable noun *la abuela* is linked to plural possessors, *nosotros*. Therefore, if the possessum is being referred as the object of many possessors, then both determiners can fulfill the possessive category. On the other hand, in contexts where the subject of the utterance refers to his own immediate family member as observed in example (6a), the article becomes constrained in its possessive role limiting possessive parallelism between the two statements as shown in (6b). This first person singular possessive was not used in the data.

(6)  a. Mi madre y mi hermano vivían en la misma casa.

My mother and my brother used to live in the same house.

b. La madre y el hermano vivían en la misma casa.

*The mother and the brother used to live in the same house.
Alienable nouns were analyzed in each context of occurrence based on whether they were objects of a possessive relationship or simply nouns without possessive role. If they were being referred to as possessums, then the criterion was to analyze whether the possessive adjective or the article could be used interchangeably (7a-b).

(7)  

a. “Nuestra casa en el Bronx donde vivimos un tiempo.” (FJOTLENA)  
Our house in the Bronx where we lived for a while.

b. La casa en el Bronx donde vivimos un tiempo.  
The house in the Bronx where we lived for a while.

However, I did not include periphrastic possessive constructions, as shown in (7c).

(7c)  

La casa de nosotros en el Bronx donde vivimos un tiempo.

*The house of ours in the Bronx where we lived for a while.

I based my selection of token samples on looking specifically at the interaction between articles and possessive adjectives in the expression of possession in a manner that could be found accurately in the English grammar and easily transferred in an
English-Spanish contact situation. The possessive periphrastic construction is commonly found in Spanish monolingual utterances, but not in English. Although, Orozco (2004) included the possessive periphrastic construction as one of the variants in his work, his analysis differs from the current one in two ways. First, his data included monolingual as well as bilingual participants, not two generations within the same bilingual contexts, and Orozco did not analyze the noun’s inalienability. Regarding the possessive periphrastic expression, Orozco claims that the Colombian variety in contact with English in New York seems to be increasing the frequency of the periphrastic possessive construction, compared to what is found in the Barranquilla monolingual dialect.

4.1 The Inalienable Pair

In the speech of participants who were raised to be bilingual and bicultural, the results confirm a preference leaning towards the use of possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns (significant factor weight of 0.61). The second generation selects the form that becomes more transparent for communication when expressing inalienable possession, as is found in English grammar (Winford, 2003: 92). This is illustrated in (8).

(8) Possessive Adjective + Inalienable (PAI)

“Yo misma me escucho en mi cabeza el acento.” (FJOTLMNC)

*I, myself, hear in my head the accent.

Accurate translation:

I hear my accent in my head.
The expression of possession in both languages, English and Spanish, lends itself to syntactic congruence. Both languages place the possessive markers in the same position and bilingual Spanish speakers can easily incorporate the possessive adjective with any noun and have little semantic alteration. This extensive use of the possessive adjective in Spanish is supported by Silva-Corvalán’s argument with regards to “the lexico-syntactic calques” where the two languages in contact share a semantic or pragmatic component (2008: 217). However, it is clear that this possessive adjective transfer can only occur in one direction, English to Spanish, where the possessive adjective gives either more transparency or emphasis to the possessive argument. The case is not the same if the transfer occurs in the other direction, from Spanish to English, where the article does not entail a possessive argument, as illustrated in (9).

(9) **Article + Inalienable (AI)**

“*Yo veo que a mis amigas las mamás siempre les dicen: oh tú no me cuentas nada.*” (FFOCMMND)

*I see that my friends the moms always tell them: oh you never tell me anything.

Accurate translation:

I see that my friends’ moms always tell them: oh you never tell me anything.

Table 2 reveals how U.S. born participants, and those who arrived during childhood, use the possessive adjective with inalienable nouns (PAI) with a greater
frequency than the immigrant group, where we see a more dynamic competition between the different constructions.

Table 2 The Inalienable Pair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Attributive Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective +</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inalienable Noun (PAI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article +</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inalienable Noun (AI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor Weight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preference for possessive adjectives appearing with inalienable nouns by second generation speakers is observed in detail when crossed with the social variables that rendered significant results in Goldvarb X.
Percentages in table 3 show how this dominant choice for possessive adjectives occurred among participants who belonged to four social categories: 1) oldest child in the family, 2) born in a Spanish speaking country, 3) grew up in a Latino community in New York, and 4) belonged to households where English and Spanish interacted intensively in family communication. These social categories show that both languages had an important presence in the lives of the participants, second generation Spanish speakers living in a country where the main language is English. However, their particular experiences allowed Spanish to remain active. The oldest child in the family communicated mostly in Spanish with parents before other siblings were born; the
participants who were born in a Spanish speaking country fully acquired Spanish, and in some cases literacy, in a monolingual environment; the Spanish second generation speakers who lived in Latino neighborhoods had frequent interaction in both languages; and lastly, the children who were allowed to bring English into their private domains, where mostly Spanish was spoken by their parents, experienced a dynamic interaction of both languages in these environments as well. In all the mentioned social factors, the presence of intense contact between English and Spanish occurred, and thus there was interaction between both possessive markers in the speech of second generation participants. It is also observed that, regardless of the results showing a preferential use for possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns, the use of the article to mark inalienable possession is still found in all social categories. This construction was used in 20 to 30 percent of the cases by this group.

Significant values that show strong preferences for possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns are found mainly in two social categories, community of residence and use of English at home as illustrated in table 4a. However, the preference for possessive adjectives by the second generation is affected negatively when the community context allows for more use of Spanish. This occurred with participants residing within Latino neighborhoods who increased their frequency of article use with inalienable nouns. Participants who used English frequently at home still present a higher use of the possessive adjective.
Table 4a Inalienable Nouns: Community of Residence and English at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd generation</th>
<th>Latino Community (10)</th>
<th>English Allowed (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessive Adjective</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same effect, but stronger, is found within households where English usage was limited. In this home environment, the use of the article increased as shown in table 4b.

Table 4b Inalienable Nouns: Community of Residence and English at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd generation</th>
<th>No-Latino Communities (7)</th>
<th>English Limited (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessive Adjective</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preference for possessive adjectives by second generation speakers decreases when the social context allows for more use of Spanish. This is the case of participants residing within Latino neighborhoods (table 4a) and Spanish speakers with restrictions on using English in their home environment (table 4b). These results reveal that when Spanish plays an important role, either as a community language or a home language, an increase in the use of the article to express possession is observed. However, this overall
preference for the use of possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns and an increase in
the usage of the article in contexts where Spanish takes precedence in participants’ daily
interaction do not minimize the importance of the interaction found between two
constructions. It is also observed that in Anglo communities where Spanish does not
have a relevant presence, the article is used as well to mark possession, as presented in
table 4b. Consequently, social variables examined with this inalienable construction
confirm the variation in the use of the possessive expression where speakers use both the
possessive adjective and the article actively, and an increase rather than a reduction of
possessive constructions is observed.
Other social variables that only pertain to the analysis of possessive expression in the
speech of the students confirm that participants who were the oldest siblings, were born
in a Spanish speaking country, and were allowed to use English freely at home use more
possessive adjectives, as is shown in table 5.

Table 5 Inalienable Nouns: Birth Order in the Family, Birth Place and English Allowed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd generation</th>
<th>Allowed English (5)</th>
<th>Limited English (12)</th>
<th>Allowed English (5)</th>
<th>Limited English (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessive Adjective</td>
<td>Possessive Adjective</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest (9)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America Born (4)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross tabulations in the context of inalienable nouns for the second generation show that the preference for the possessive adjective is most common in their New York City Spanish variety. The use of the article only increases in domains where English is limited in home communication.

In contrast to the results shown above for second generation speakers, a competition between the possessive adjective and the article before inalienable nouns is found among first generation speakers, with a slight preference for the article, as was shown in table 2 (53.8% articles versus 46.2% for the possessive adjectives). Variation in this preference is observed among those who owned businesses such as grocery stores or hair salons, as well as among professionals working as administrative assistants or real estate agents, and skilled employees that held jobs as mechanics, cooling and heating technicians. Participants with low education levels contribute to this change from the initial preference as well. Their preference slightly favored the possessive adjectives, reflected in table 6.
Table 6 Effect of Social Factors on the Expression of Inalienable Possession 1st Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Factor and Number of Participants</th>
<th>Possessive Adjective + Inalienable (PAI)</th>
<th>Article + Inalienable (AI)</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Business (5)</td>
<td>18/33</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>15/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (4)</td>
<td>30/51</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>21/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (4)</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (8)</td>
<td>37/78</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>41/78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, the use of possessive adjectives among first generation immigrants does not present frequencies higher than 65% within the mentioned social factors. This confirms that both forms are found and used interchangeably by this group. Especially noteworthy is that all these participants immigrated to the U.S. after complete acquisition of their native language. They also brought their particular Spanish dialect with them, contributing to the complexity of language contact found in the greater New York metropolitan area. These results add to the argument that even though English is the dominant language of the host country, domains where Spanish still maintains a significant presence allow for different forms to be maintained.

Orozco (2004) found that his data from monolingual speakers contained high rates of usage of the possessive adjective. This implies that the possessive adjective construction, which is structurally the closest to the English form, is found in monolingual Spanish. Therefore, occurrence of this variant in New York Spanish speakers may not be
necessarily a result of language contact. Given that the present study includes a diverse group of Spanish speakers, and both variants are found among first generation speakers, second generation speakers may have learned and used both variants in their interaction with parents.

Current data for inalienable possessive adjectives in the speech of the second generation confirms similar results to those reached by Hnat (2008) regarding redundant possessives in the Spanish of Mexico and the U.S. South-West. She found that inalienable possession with body parts and daily use items shows a change in progress in the Spanish variety of Houston. When she compared three generations, the results revealed that second and third generations were the most innovative in marking the possessive relationship with possessive adjectives. In Mexico City, a competition among variants was found showing a frequent use of dative possessive adjectives leading to redundant possessive expressions in this variety as well. She argues that in the Spanish of the United States the subject and the clitic have lost their possessive function and it has been transferred to the possessive adjective; therefore, bilingual speakers use the possessive adjective in contexts where monolinguals favor the article (Hnat 2008: 55). Examples (10a-b) are from Hnat’s data.

(10)  a. “Jorge se corta su pelo cada dos semanas.” (Hnat, 2008: 55)

Jorge cuts his hair every two weeks.
b. “Jorge me corta mi pelo cada dos semanas.” (Hnat, 2008: 56)

Jorge cuts my hair every two weeks.

Hnat (2008: 164) mentions that the close contact with English in the United States in media and commercial transactions allows for innovative uses of inalienable possession, and she foresees a rapid simplification process with regards to possessive expression in Mexico due to its deep contact with English. My results in the usage of the possessive with inalienable nouns show that there is a notable difference between the two generations of speakers. The current study presents uses of both constructions in competition in the speech of the first generation while the second generation is leaning towards the construction that is more congruent with English. In this case, I conclude that there is an intergenerational language change in progress pertaining to inalienable possessive expression. Children use a form that is more restricted in the speech of their parents.

Regardless of this difference between generations, I do not perceive the preference found in participants who grew up bilingual as part of a rapid simplification process towards one form, i.e. the use of possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns (PAI), because the article with inalienable nouns (AI) is also frequently found. On the contrary, I deduce that both constructions coexist, were acquired during early childhood, and in those domains where one language predominates more than the other, it triggers the use of various forms; so in an English domain, the possessive adjective would
increase its occurrence, and in a Spanish domain, there would be more of a tendency for
the article to be used.

To sum up, in the case of variation with inalienable nominal possession, it seems
that exposure to Spanish within community or home domains increased the use of the
article in the second generation, especially if the children were born in Latin America and
were the oldest in the family. In addition, the variation found in the data extracted from
the first generation’s speech reveals that both forms co-existed and that second generation
speakers may have learned to use both forms from interactions with their parents, which
was reinforced by conditions of language contact.

4.2 The Alienable Pair
Nominal possession with alienable nouns shows great variation, with slightly contrasting
preferences between both generations. The first generation shows some preference for
possessive adjectives, and they still show 40% use of articles with alienable nouns. The
second generation presents a slightly higher preference for articles, with a 38.8% of
possessive adjectives used with alienable nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributive Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Adjective + Alienable Noun (PAA)</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article + Alienable Noun (AA)</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Weight</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant factor weights for the second generation are found with the following social variables: Latin American born, mixed social networks, and limited use of English at home. The percentages show a preference for articles with alienable nouns between 54% and 64% for the second generation, as shown in table 8.

Table 8 Effect of Social Factors on the Expression of Alienable Possession 2nd Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Factor and Number of Participants</th>
<th>Possessive Adjective + Alienable (PAA)</th>
<th>Article + Alienable (AA)</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Born</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America (4)</td>
<td>62/136 45.6%</td>
<td>74/136 54.4%</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Social Network</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (6)</td>
<td>61/167 36.5%</td>
<td>106/167 63.5%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Social Network</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (16)</td>
<td>207/531 39%</td>
<td>324/531 61%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Use at Home</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited (12)</td>
<td>190/478 39.7%</td>
<td>288/478 60.3%</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social variables that reveal significant results are active in the use of Spanish of early bilinguals. Children who were born in Latin America had Spanish as their first language during early childhood. People who grew up in mixed social networks used
Spanish frequently as their language of communication. Students who described their college social networks as mixed still utilize Spanish for social interaction. Lastly, children who experienced limitations in their use of English in their households gave Spanish preponderance in their interactions between generations. Consequently, the use of article determiners remains active in second generation speakers circumscribed by the community and the home languages.

Participants who grew up bilingual present higher frequencies of article use. However, this preference becomes less clear in the presence of one factor: community of residence. If they are part of a mostly Anglo community where English is dominant, their use of possessive adjectives with alienable nouns increases. This is shown in table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd generation</th>
<th>Latino Possessive Adjective</th>
<th>Anglo Possessive Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, table 10 shows results obtained from a cross tabulation that includes the use of English at home as a factor. These results reveal that students slightly increase their use of possessive adjectives in environments where English was limited. This confirms the dynamic use of both forms in Spanish speaking environments, which allows me to conclude that the possessive adjective is not only the English construction
transferred by default into Spanish, but that this construction may exist as well within domains where Spanish is preponderant.

Table 10 Alienable Nouns: English at Home in Second Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd generation</th>
<th>Allowed English Possessive Adjective</th>
<th>Limited English Possessive Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This variation and the role of language domain do not support the hypothesis of a linguistic transfer, but indicate the existence of both forms in their Spanish linguistic repertoire. The same is the case for the factor of birth place, where Latin American born children who had a limited use of English at home reveal an increase in the use of possessive adjectives with alienable nouns, shown in table 11. Therefore, the variation and the slight increase in the use of possessive adjectives, in contexts where Spanish was the dominant language, are not a consequence of any language transfer.
In the case of first generation speakers, preference for the possessive adjective with alienable nouns is more common and percentages reach 77%, with the lowest being 60%. Participants with professional occupations and college education levels present a significantly higher preference for possessive adjective use. It is interesting to notice, in table 12, how first generation speakers show a higher preference for a Spanish possessive structure that parallels the English one.

Table 11 Alienable Nouns: Birth Place and English Allowed at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd generation</th>
<th>Allowed English Possessive Adjective</th>
<th>Limited English Possessive Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Born</td>
<td>39% Article</td>
<td>47% Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this point, a question arises about the use of possessive adjectives with alienable nouns within their monolingual Spanish varieties. There is little research available on the possessive expression of Spanish in contact with English. However, the use of possessive adjectives in monolingual varieties was discussed by Hnat (2008) for Mexico City, and by Orozco (2004) for Barranquilla, Colombia. Both found the construction when analyzing their speakers’ language outcomes, and Hnat deduced an increase of the variant in places where Spanish comes into contact with English.

Table 12 Effect of Social Factors on the Expression of Alienable Possession 1st Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Factor and Number of Participants</th>
<th>Possessive Adjective + Alienable</th>
<th>Article + Alienable</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (4)</td>
<td>46/61 75.4%</td>
<td>15/61 24.6%</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of Residence N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (13)</td>
<td>76/125 60.8%</td>
<td>49/125 39.2%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Skills N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced (12)</td>
<td>74/121 61.2%</td>
<td>47/121 38.8%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (8)</td>
<td>84/109 77.1%</td>
<td>25/109 22.9%</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of English at Home N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited (21)</td>
<td>135/223 60.5%</td>
<td>88/223 39.5%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Godenzzi (2010) also studied the use of the double possessive in Andean contexts where Spanish, Quechua and Aimara are in contact and found the use of possessive adjectives in addition to the periphrastic construction with a variety of nouns, both inalienable and alienable. Godenzzi did not conduct a quantitative language variation study, but an analysis on the adaptation and dissemination of a language change; therefore, he did not present any comparison to other speakers where Spanish was not in contact with the indigenous language. His analysis focused on presenting the double possessive expression in contexts with strong Quechua and Aimara language contact, and how this change may travel from rural to urban and later to transnational contexts. This is the same construction that Hnat refers to as “redundant possessives” (2008) and claims to be a form found in the Spanish in contact with the Nahuatl language. Example (11a-b) illustrates the case of double possession by Godenzzi.

(11) a. “Justo en la casa de sus papás de Fredy, yo vivo con Fredy en la casa.”
(2010:64)
Just at Fredy’s parents’ house, I live with Fredy in the house.

The lady spoke, and this way I followed her commands.
The possessive expressions studied by Godenzzi (2010), Hnat (2008) and Orozco (2004) reveal that the use of possessive adjectives vary in monolingual Spanish, and it is possible that the first generation participants of the present study used this form prior to their arrival in the U.S.

The place of origin factor provides some more information about a possible preference of possessive adjectives with alienable nouns. The variant presents the highest percentages in two regions: the Central American and the Andean, as is indicated in table 13. My results agree with those of previous studies realized in the Central American and the Andean regions, by Hnat (2008) and Godenzzi (2010), where possessive adjectives marking the possessor - possessum relationship were common. However, these percentages, based on national origin, cannot lead to any conclusive results unless a monolingual community group is studied and compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and Number of Participants</th>
<th>Possessive Adjective + Alienable</th>
<th>Article + Alienable</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central America (4)</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andes (8)</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean (10)</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cone (2)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula (1)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Frequency of the Alienable Variant and Place of Origin of 1st Generation Speakers
To conclude, with regards to variation in the expression of alienable nominal possession, one can infer that there is a competition between variants within both generations of speakers without any notable preference. My results additionally show an expansion in the use of the possessive expression with alienable nouns. Both, possessive adjectives and articles, are used to mark a possessive relationship. This variation increases in the case of second generation speakers if there is a greater use of Spanish at home. Regarding first generation speakers, the variation found reveals the use of possessive adjectives with alienable nouns. These results reflect the input that children received from parents; the second generation was acquiring the possessive adjective variant as well as the article from the Spanish spoken by their parents.

My argument with regards to alienable possessive expression is that there is no sign of a change in progress favoring any of the variants that may lead to an elimination of the other. This disproves my initial hypothesis that second generation Spanish speakers would prefer the English default variant, present in both languages. In the case of alienable nouns, results show both forms used more extensively than expected in ordinary practice resulting in competition.

4.3 The Ambiguous Nouns

Nouns selected within this category were few and were identified as having a variable reading regarding inalienability. Tradition, morals, culture, language, and nationality are intrinsic concepts in human experience, in other words processes inherent to being a social human being, therefore lived by all in normal conditions. However, a person acquires specific traditions, morals, language and interiorizes particular cultures
and nationalities depending on the contexts where she grows up. In the process, her
relation to language, traditions, cultures…etc. may be modified, thus providing the
relationship between possessors and possessums with some degree of alienability.
Examples (12 and 13) present the variation found with these particular nouns either using
the article or the possessive adjective.

(12) “Porque cuando estoy en casa mi lengua es español.” (FSGTLMNS)
    Because when I am at home my language is Spanish.

(13) “Quiero hablarlo porque es importante en mi cultura.” (FFOCMMND)
    I want to speak it because it is important in my culture.

Results in this category reveal a similar tendency within both groups, where they
prefer to place possessive adjectives before these particular nouns. There is a linguistic
particularity with these nouns that I further develop later in this chapter and may be a
reason for the preference.
Table 14 The Ambiguous Nouns in 1st and 2nd Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Possessive Adjective + Ambiguous Noun</th>
<th>Article + Ambiguous Noun</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Generation</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a structural aspect when analyzing the possessive expression in these nouns that needs to be considered in the current study. Utterances using these particular nouns can occur either with personal subject pronouns or in an impersonal construction that relates not to one individual, but to all human kind since, as I mentioned before, these concepts are natural to all people. Examples (14a-b) show both constructions.

(14)  a. *Y sin yo saber español, no puedo entender mucho de mi cultura.*

And without *my* knowing of Spanish, *I cannot* understand a lot about *my* culture.

b. “*Y sin [a] saber español, no se puede entender mucho de la cultura.***

(FJUTLMYE)

And without *[a] knowing Spanish, one cannot understand a lot about *the* culture.
There were few tokens showing the use of these nouns as presented in table 1 above. By analyzing the details of each utterance, all the speech samples using possessive adjectives occur in personalized discourse of the type (14a) above. On the other hand, samples where the article takes the place of a possessive adjective vary. Only six token samples, five for second and one for first generation speakers, present a personalized construction using article determiners as shown in examples (15) and (16). These tokens always had plural subjects, either first or third person plural subject pronouns.

(15) “Siempre han tratado de mantenernos en la cultura hispana.” (FIOTLENA)

They always have tried to keep us in the Hispanic Culture.

(16) “Lo que les hemos enseñado es de que no pierdan las tradiciones.” (SEUONE)

Whatever we have taught them, it is so that they don’t lose the traditions.

All the other speech samples using articles were part of impersonal constructions referring to the concepts of culture and language in relation to the human kind as shown in example (14a) above. Consequently, as I mentioned early in chapter four, ambiguous inalienability reading requires more word analysis in particular syntactic contexts before coding the possessive function, and requires more available data in order to deduce significant results or differences from other nouns.
4.4 The Stressed Possessive Adjective

The stressed possessive adjective is the only variant in the attributive category that is analyzed throughout the entire data in order to show its frequency. This possessive construction occurs in the data as parallel to the use of a possessive adjective. Speakers use it instead of the possessive adjective with no purpose of emphasizing the possessive relationship. It is a more common variant in monolingual Spanish, and transfer is not supported by language contact since its equivalent in English is not commonly used or it is ungrammatical (17-18).

(17) “Los compañeros tuyos que son solamente americanos.” (SLUCND)

*The classmates of yours that are only Americans.

Accurate translation:

Your classmates that are only Americans.

(18) “Trato de ser mejor que los padres míos.” (FSUTMMNC)

*I try to be better than the parents of mine.

Accurate translation:

I try to be better than my parents.

The above examples show how the speakers preferred the stressed possessive adjective in instances where the common possessive adjective can be used: tus
compañeros and mis padres. Quantitative analysis shows that first generation speakers use stressed possessive adjectives slightly more than second generation speakers (table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressed Possessive Adjective</th>
<th>Factor weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>72/549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Generation</td>
<td>46/886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presents a low use of this attributive possessive expression by both generations. However, parents show a higher frequency than their children. Considering that this possessive attributive possession variant is less likely to occur in a transfer situation, I decided to look at it in the place of origin of the first generation speakers. Table 16 presents the distribution of stressed possessive adjectives used with regards to that variable.
The number of tokens is too low to deduce a conclusion regarding its use, and more data in monolingual speech communities would need to be collected to come to any precise conclusion. However, initial findings highlight the use of the stressed possessive adjective in the Caribbean and Andes region particularly among Colombians and Dominicans.

### 4.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, there are two different results regarding the expression of attributive possession. On the one hand, inalienable possession in the case of second generation speakers indicates an intergenerational change in progress leading to a more frequent use of possessive adjectives when compared to the variation found among first generation speakers. Nevertheless, this change is not leading to strong reduction in the usage of the articles to mark the possessive relationship. On the contrary, what the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and Number of First Generation Participants</th>
<th>Number of Tokens</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central America (4)</td>
<td>4/89</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andes (8)</td>
<td>30/210</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean (10)</td>
<td>25/187</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cone (2)</td>
<td>9/50</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula (1)</td>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results indicate is that both forms have existed, with inalienable nouns, in the speech of the second generation participants since their early bilingualism.

Results from the data on the expression of possession with alienable nouns show the use of both variants by both generations. There was a slightly contrasting preference between the two generations, where parents favored the use of possessive adjectives and their children the use of articles. This suggests that in the Spanish of New York various forms are found in what concerns the possessive expression. Therefore, I conclude that both forms coexist in various domains where intergenerational speakers use Spanish. The second generation’s use of possessive adjectives versus articles is not a provable consequence of language contact only, but a result of their early exposure to Spanish and bilingualism.

Results for both generations reveal that external factors, community and home language domains, play an important role in the outcome. Dominant presence of Spanish increases the overall use of the article, either with inalienable or alienable nouns. The speech of the second generation does not present a reduction in their use of the article to mark the possessive link next to alienable nouns. Although it is not their preferred variant with inalienable nouns, the form remains active as well. Consequently, from the speech samples in this study, I am able to conclude that Spanish speakers in the greater New York metropolitan area use articles as well as possessive adjectives to mark alienable possession regardless of their generation, whereas in the case of inalienable possession, second generation Spanish speakers present a change where they favor the use of possessive adjectives to mark inalienable possession compared to the speech of their parents, the first generation.
Chapter five: Results Predicative possession
The current chapter discusses the results found regarding the expression of predicative possession. First, it describes the process of data coding; second, it shows the distributions of each linguistic variant per generation; and lastly, it analyzes the co-variation between the linguistic variants and the external social factors.

The expression of predicative possession in the current work focused on the frequency and uses of the verb *tener* “to have”. The three pairs of variants observed included the presence or the absence of *tener* to imply possession. In chapter two, the functionality of the verb *tener* was presented by comparing English and Spanish constructions, and it was stated that this verb serves multiple semantic purposes in English, while in Spanish its use is basically limited to imply possession or modality, in terms of obligation: *tener que trabajar, estudiar y terminar esta tesis* “to have to work, study, and finish this thesis”. Therefore, the objective of the predicative possession analysis is to determine if frequency of *tener* has increased in other contexts where other forms are more common.

There was another variant included in the analysis that did not involve the use of *tener*. This is the presence of dative/accusative pronouns with an implicit possessive relation between the subject and the object. The dative accusative pronoun variant is not observed in any pair, but it will be compared to the entire data to reveal its frequency in relation to the expression of possession.

The first pair of variants observed included the verb *tener* + possessive adjectives + inalienable or alienable nouns. This complements previous results analyzed for attributive possession. *Tener* already implies a possessive relationship and there is no need for the possessive adjective to be part of the utterance. Despite the redundancy of
this possessive marking, participants use it with alienable or inalienable nouns, often with
the purpose of emphasizing or clarifying the possessive relationship as illustrated in
example (1), from a first generation speaker and (2) from a second generation speaker.

(1)  “Ella tiene su abuela arriba.” (SLWOYR)
    She has her grandmother upstairs.

(2)  “Creo que hasta tiene su máster.” (FJOTLMNC)
    I think that she even has her masters.

The second set of variants compared existence versus possession through the
verbs haber and tener. Tokens were selected for analysis depending on whether both
verbs can be used without altering the possessive relationship. Examples (3a-b) show
uses of these two verbs by the first generation.

(3)  a. “Aquí los hijos tienen más oportunidades.” (PEWCNM)
    Here the children have more opportunities.

    b. Aquí hay más oportunidades para los hijos.
    Here, there are more opportunities for the children.
It has to be noted that the topic of the conversation presented a great constraint for the analysis and comparison between parents and children. Identifying specific contexts in which the two groups use both verbs confirms that the first generation prefers tener when referring to their children’s particular experiences, their school programs and practices. The topics addressed by the first generation were specifically related to having trips or games at school, educational opportunities, bilingual programs, freedom, and discipline. On the other hand, the second generation presents a more descriptive discourse that was not necessarily reporting on their direct experiences, but their perceptions of their bilingual / bicultural context. In most cases the verb haber was used by the second generation to describe the existence of people, programs, and resources or specific places in their environment. Examples (4) and (5) illustrate the use of haber emphasizing existence or tener emphasizing possession in the second generation.

(4) “Allí cerca de mi casa hay un teatro que se llama ‘teatro Talia’.”
(FJOTLMNC)
By my house, there is a theater that is called Talia Theater.

(5) “Somos un commonwealth, como es lo mismo, como tiene MacDonalds,
todo de shopping places y cosas así.” (FSOTLMYR)
We are a commonwealth, like it is the same, like it has MacDonalds,
everything about shopping places, and things like that.
The third point of analysis consists of determining the competition between tener and other verbs or constructions that imply possession, thereby eliminating the need for explicit possessive marking by the use of tener. This particular analysis employed the concept of “semantic bleaching” (Heine, 1997). It is a process that occurs when various syntactic constructions evolve towards expressing one semantic function, in this case the possessive.

The first generation uses a variety of constructions that can be replaced by the verb tener. Common utterances among these participants involve verbs such as “to grab” coger (6a-b) and “to get” obtener or conseguir (7a-b).

(6)  a. “Ellos cogieron a todos los niños latinos que habían para ese curso.”

(PEWCNE)

They grabbed all the Latino kids that were there for that course.

b. Ellos tenían a todos los niños latinos que habían para ese curso.

They had all the Latino kids that were there for that course.

(7)  a. “Es más fácil tener una droga que tener algún licor.” (PEWCNM)

*It is easier to have a drug, than to have some liquor.

b. Es más fácil conseguir una droga que conseguir algún licor.

It is easier to get drugs than to get liquor.
The last construction analyzed in predicative possession was the use of dative/accusative pronouns in order to imply possession. Here again, the topic of the conversation, as discussed above, affected the occurrence of this particular construction. All the tokens coded for the first generation using dative/accusative pronouns were establishing a possessive link to their children as shown in (8).

(8) “Ella se me enamoró allá.” (SEUFNC)

She [the daughter] fell in love over there.

There were only three tokens of using this construction by the second generation. The use of this variant was very specific and required for semantic purposes. It was not solely to imply the possessive link but also the actions derived from that link. Example (9) from the second generation shows one of the uses of dative/accusative object pronouns to imply possession.

(9) “Ella era mi primera amiga y me ayudaba y me tomaba la leche para que podia salir a jugar.” (FJOTLENA)

She was my first friend and she used to help me and she used to drink my milk so I could go out to play.
As presented in chapter three, there are seven predicative variants and six of them are studied in corresponding pairs. The total number of predicative token samples was 561 (second generation 330; first generation 231). The distribution of tokens for both generations is presented in table 1.

### Table 1 Frequency of the Predicative Constructions per Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Predicative Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tener + Possessive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective + Inalienable</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tener + Possessive Adjective+ Alienable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tener Instead of Haber</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haber Instead of Tener</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Possessive Verbs Instead of Tener</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tener Instead of Other Possessive Verbs</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dative/Accusative Implicit Possessive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are four important outcomes from table 1 that I will be analyzing in detail in the following sections. First, redundant possessive markings using tener with possessive adjective are found more often with alienable nouns in both generations. Second, the two generations show opposite results in the use of tener versus haber; this
sheds light on the different discourses employed by participants to emphasize direct experience with a possessum object, or existence without a possessive relationship. Third, the second generation uses a variety of verbs and constructions to state the possessive link, but an expansion in the use of the verb tener by the second generation is not observed. Lastly, the frequency of dative and accusative pronouns to imply possession is low and mostly occurs in the speech of the first generation.

5.1 Tener + Possessive Adjective + Inalienable/Alienable Constructions

Previously, in chapter four sections 4.1 and 4.2, attributive possession results showed greater competition between the possessive adjective and the article with inalienable nouns among the first generation of speakers, whereas among the second generation of speakers the preference leaned towards the use of possessive adjectives next to inalienable nouns. On the other hand, results dealing with alienable nouns presented similar rates for both generations. I noted that the verb tener, in predicative possession, modifies the variant. With inalienable nouns, it is uncommon to produce utterances such as tiene su tía “she has her aunt” unless the speaker’s intention is to emphasize the relationship and uniqueness of this particular person in inalienable possession. Therefore, tokens of this type are infrequent, whereas the use of tener and possessive adjectives before alienable nouns provides necessary information for the possessive link that the definite or indefinite article cannot provide. For example: tengo el/ un carro “I have a/the car” does not necessary imply that it belongs to the subject. The verb tener functions as a marker of temporary possession without specifying ownership, whereas the addition of the possessive adjective to the utterance gives a clear
ownership link between the possessor and the possessum: tengo mi carro “I have my car”. Therefore, cases leaning towards the use of possessive adjectives with alienable nouns in the presence of the verb tener are more frequent. Table 2 shows that the use of a redundant possessive with alienable nouns is favored by both generations.

Table 2 Tener + Possessive Adjective + Inalienable or Alienable Noun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicative Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tener + Possessive Adjective + Inalienable</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tener + Possessive Adjective + Alienable</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is shown in table 3, results are interpreted under the factors “community of residence” and “English skills” by the first generation. Results show that those with advanced English proficiency favor this construction; preference is for double possessive markings with alienable nouns. However, a competition of forms involving inalienable as well as alienable nouns is found in the case of informants residing in Latino communities with advanced English proficiencies. The results corroborate the idea that although the construction is not necessarily a consequence of language contact, its usage may increase in the case of fluent bilinguals.
Table 3  *Tener* + Possessive Adjective + Inalienable or Alienable Nouns:

Community of Residence and English Skills in 1st Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latino Community</th>
<th>Anglo Community</th>
<th>Latino Community</th>
<th>Anglo Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced English</td>
<td>Advanced English</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inalienable Noun</td>
<td>Inalienable Noun</td>
<td>Inalienable Noun</td>
<td>Inalienable Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of the second generation, the results show that for participants with limited use of English at home, regardless of their birth place, the preference still remains *tener* + possessive adjectives with alienable nouns. There is a small increase towards the usage of *tener* + possessive adjective with inalienable nouns among those who were born in the U.S., and even more so for those who, being U.S. born, were also allowed to use English at home freely (table 4).

Table 4  *Tener* + Possessive Adjective + Inalienable or Alienable Nouns:

Birth Place and English Allowed at Home in 2nd Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowed English Inalienable Noun</td>
<td>Allowed English Inalienable Noun</td>
<td>Limited English Inalienable Noun</td>
<td>Limited English Inalienable Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
<td>Alienable Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the results of the first pair of constructions analyzed, \textit{tener} + possessive adjectives with inalienable or alienable nouns, show that there is a tendency for the same usage between the two generations. Preference, if any, is influenced by the degree of importance that both languages maintain, either in the participants’ private or public domains. For parents residing in communities where mostly English is spoken, the redundant possessive variant with alienable nouns increased. In the case of their children, home domains that limited their use of English also presented a preference for redundant possession with alienable nouns. When analyzing inalienable nouns, it was found that although it is not the preferred form, its frequencies increase if children are allowed to use English at home freely for communication. Results show that with both attributive and predicative possession, possessive adjectives with alienable nouns are found. Especially noteworthy is the fact that this construction is commonly found in Spanish for purposes of clarification or emphasis, hence its frequency. In contexts where the two languages are in contact, constraints are reduced and the form, which is also found in English, is encouraged. On the other hand, tokens with possessive adjectives and inalienable nouns were more common in attributive possessive utterances where the verb \textit{tener} was not present, and not common in instances of predicative redundant possession.

\subsection*{5.2 Tener versus Haber between Generations}

Tokens expressing existence through the use of \textit{haber} or possessive relationship through the use of the verb \textit{tener} reveal an opposite preference between generations. The first generation uses \textit{tener} significantly more, whereas the second generation uses \textit{haber} when \textit{tener} would be possible in the same semantic context (table 5).
Table 5 Tener versus Haber between Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicative Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tener Instead of Haber</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haber Instead of Tener</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described earlier in this chapter, the case of tener versus haber presents a variation affected by discourse. The first generation uses both verbs with a clear semantic difference. It was clear that utterances with tener were specifically addressing direct experience rather than existence. For example, the speaker in example (10a) is from the first generation, and he was referring to his children who are of Latino origin. In his opinion, a child that belongs to this cultural background possesses certain qualities such as respect for parents. The possessive link is derived from that direct experience.

(10) a. “Los hijos hispanos tienen más respeto hacia los padres.” (BEUFNE)

The Hispanic children have more respect towards the parents.

On the other hand, (10b) presents an opinion emphasizing the existence of a quality generally found among Hispanic children according to the speaker. In this case, the opinion of having more respect for parents is not directly associated with his particular children. On the contrary, it is a general description of an ethnic group. Therefore, the need to highlight existence using the verb haber rather than possession.
Throughout the interview, most of the conversation topics were in reference to the informants’ children. Consequently, direct personal experiences triggered the use of tener, and not haber in the case of the first generation. In addition to the context described above, examples (11) and (12) show how the first generation also uses tener to relate to people with whom they interact socially (guests, people they supervise or interact with at work, and tenants). If the speaker/possessor has established a direct relationship to the possessum then tener is used.

(11) “Tengo policías en mi departamento.” (SLWOYR)

I have policemen in my department.

(meaning co-workers that relate to his job duty)

Another example of this kind comes from a teacher in a school who uses tener in order to imply a working relationship with her students’ families. The informant expresses the contact that she has with these parents in a possessive construction as illustrated in example (12).
“Yo tengo aquí cuatro familias que tienen hijos en el programa.”

I have here four families that have children in the program.

Only three tokens are found among the first generation in their use of haber and those are instances implying the existence of family in their immigrant experience. Example (13) shows inalienable possession expressed with haber rather than tener.

“No todos los primos, hay primos por lo menos que no hablan español.”

Not all the cousins, there are cousins, at least, that don’t speak Spanish.

On the other hand, utterances found among the second generation mostly referred to the existence of family, friends, teachers, programs, parties at school, and opportunities, but from the perspective of an observer rather than an experiencer, in which case haber was commonly used. Example (14) illustrates the case of existence versus possession expressed by the second generation participants in the study.
Choice of variants was analyzed with regard to social variables to determine the second generation’s preference for *haber* utterances. I only analyzed the second generation’s results since they presented some variation, whereas parents showed limited competition of forms as presented in table 5 above.

In table 6, the initial preference shown by students becomes clearer when interpreted together with external factors such as the use of Spanish at home for communication. In this particular analysis, I am only considering the oldest children in the family since they show the most variation with *tener* and *haber*. There were 9 older children, out of 17 total participants, presenting a significant factor weight of 0.51. Table 6 shows that when English is allowed, there is more variation, whereas the initial preference for *haber* is still the case in domains where English is limited.

**Table 6**  *Tener* versus *Haber*: Birth Order in the Family and English Allowed at Home in 2nd Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eldest English Allowed</th>
<th>Eldest English Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tener</strong></td>
<td><strong>Haber</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haber</strong></td>
<td><strong>Haber</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sum, results for *haber* and *tener* show that the topic of the conversation plays an important part in the selection of verbs. The topic, itself, impedes the interchangeable use of *tener* and *haber*. In my initial analysis of these two verbs in chapter two, and later in chapter three, I proposed a pair of tokens using *tener* and *haber* to convey the same meaning. However, after the quantification and examination of the utterances expressed by both generations, I realized that meaning or emphasis change depending on the verb used. Therefore, I cannot conclude that one verb may be preferred over the other because they are not used with the same semantic purpose.

### 5.3 Other Possessive Verbs versus *Tener* between Generations

Within the other possessive verbs category, the results reveal that first generation speakers have equal rates of use for *tener* and other verbs that imply possession. However, the second generation presents preference for *tener* compared to other possessive constructions that do not involve *tener* (table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicative Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Verbs</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of <em>tener</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tener Instead of</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Possessive Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor weight</strong></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early in this chapter, I explained my criteria for including the tokens analyzed in this category. Utterances that included another verb that could be replaced by tener and still imply a possessive relationship were analyzed in pairs. This is illustrated in (15a-b) and (16a-b)

(15)  

a. “Tú en tu casa tienes español.” (PEWCNM)

You in your house have Spanish.

b. Tú en tu casa hablas español.

You in your house speak Spanish.

(16)  

a. “Es bueno que tengan los dos idiomas, que tengan el español y el inglés.” (SEUFNG)

It is good that they have the two languages, that they have Spanish and English.

b. Es bueno que hablen/sepan los dos idiomas, que hablen/sepan español e inglés.

It is good that they speak/know the two languages, that they speak/know Spanish and English.
An analysis of these constructions using various verbs, as well as tener, suggests a discourse constraint. This makes it difficult to conclude that the verb tener can be replaced without any semantic alteration. Utterances with the verb tener specifically make reference to a concrete possession experience where there is an obvious relationship between possessor and possessum. On the other hand, constructions using other verbs in roughly parallel contexts were expressing or emphasizing a particular skill and not necessarily possession. It is possible that this situation might equally be stated as a possessive relationship. However, I cannot conclude that the use of the verb tener is increasing, or not, as I proposed in my initial hypothesis.

An instance that illustrates cases where I considered that tener can take the place of a more specific verb is shown in example (17). The speaker preferred to use a periphrastic construction using tener where a more specific verb such as alquilar ‘to rent’ can take place. It is necessary to clarify in this case that the preference for tener instead of other possible constructions is found in monolingual varieties of Spanish, and the selection of one verb over another is not related to language contact, but to discourse and vocabulary proficiency factors.

(17) “Hacían muchas preguntas para que uno pudiera tener una renta.”

(SEWONA)

They asked so many questions so that one can have a rental.
I will now consider the use of these constructions and the effect of the two social variables that are applicable to both generations: community of residence and English usage at home in table 8. In the case of the second generation, it is observed that regardless of their preference for a variety of predicative possessive constructions, whenever the domain allows the use of Spanish, tener has a rate of about 25% compared to the approximately 15% within contexts where English is predominant. On the other hand, the first generation does not present a particular pattern. The use of different kinds of possessive constructions in addition to tener is equally observed.

Table 8 Tener versus Other Possessive Verbs:
Community of Residence and English Use at Home between Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latino Tener</th>
<th>Anglo Tener</th>
<th>Allowed Tener</th>
<th>Limited Tener</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Verbs</td>
<td>Other Verbs</td>
<td>Other Verbs</td>
<td>Other Verbs</td>
<td>Other Verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant values:  
Anglo > 0.63  1st generation > 0.53  
Allowed > 0.62  2nd generation > 0.64

An initial summary of the use of these two forms, tener and other verbs, analyzed with this pair of sociolinguistic variables, community of residence and language use at
home, sheds light on the role that each language plays within the speakers’ language domains. If both languages play an important role at home or in the community domain, it results in more variation. However, a case for interference becomes too difficult to make with this type of construction because the concept of the verb tener ‘to have’ is not more particular to one language than the other, although its role is multifunctional in English and more restricted in Spanish. The other possessive constructions considered in the data are common in monolingual varieties of both languages, and a selection of those instead of tener may be a consequence of different proficiencies, speech registers, or the specifics of the speech act.

5.4 Dative/Accusative implicit Possessive between Generations

Regardless of the low occurrence of this particular construction, the first generation uses it more frequently to imply a possessive relationship. This is clearly a consequence of the topic of the conversation as was explained early in the chapter. Table 9 shows the distributions of this option per generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicative Variants</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dative/Accusative Implicit Possessive</td>
<td>19/231 8.2%</td>
<td>3/331 0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The topic of the conversation is definitively a factor that has an effect on the outcome. Parents were talking about their children and were constantly using object
pronouns to emphasize how the actions of their children affected themselves in a kin possessive relationship as illustrated in example (18)

(18) “La niña me faltaba mucho a la escuela.” (SLUOND)

La niña me faltaba

[Def Det + DAT Possessum + DAT Possessor/Speaker + Verb +
mucho a la escuela
Adv + Prep + Def Det + ACC Possessum]

*The girl (for me) missed school a lot.
Accurate translation:
My daughter missed a lot of school days.

On the other hand, the second generation rarely spoke about the actions of their parents. When they referred to their parents, the use of possessive adjectives or articles frequently established the kin possessive relationship.

5.5 Conclusion

In the case of predicative possession, the semantic value of the utterance is key to understanding its use. Although some variants could be used interchangeably in syntactic terms, they may not be interpreted equally by the interlocutor. In addition, the use of more frequent constructions may be linked to proficiency and discourse contexts.
Nevertheless, it was observed that variation increased if both languages shared the same importance within a given domain. The second generation does not have a reduced linguistic repertoire with regards to expressing predicative possession. On the contrary, a variety of forms are found within the speech of Hispanics who grew up bilingual in New York, and one can infer that there is no language change in progress with regards to a possible expansion in the use of the verb *tener*.

Lastly, the use of possessive adjectives with the verb *tener*, a redundant possessive, occurs less frequently with inalienable and more frequently with alienable nouns. This distribution leads me to conclude that, in fact, possessive redundancy with inalienable nouns is not so common, whereas with alienable nouns the presence of the possessive adjective serves a semantic functionality for clarification of permanent ownership. Therefore, the presence of the possessive adjective with alienable nouns cannot be considered redundant, but should be interpreted as needed in certain possessive contexts. Both generations showed the same tendency, proving once more that the selected variant is affected by discourse type and that it is not particular to the variety of Spanish in the U.S., but can be found in any Spanish speaking dialect.
Chapter 6: Discussion
This dissertation analyzed possession as it is expressed grammatically in Spanish when in contact with English in two generations of speakers of various dialects. The objective was to investigate variation in the expression of possession as observed across two generations of Hispanic speakers in the greater New York metropolitan area. Early in the introduction, I formulated three research questions as follows: 1) Is there a pattern that differentiates the two groups in the expression of possession? 2) How might interaction between English and Spanish affect variation in the Spanish possessive expression used by second generation speakers? 3) What sociolinguistic factors influence the difference between the parents and their children’s expression of possession?

In what follows, I discuss each construction separately and answer the research questions. Then, the dissertation concludes by stating the particularities of the participants and the limitations of the methodology used. Finally, based on the results, I propose some ideas for future research to further investigate the expression of possession in Spanish in bilingual and multidialectal contexts.

In chapter two, I compared the role that the possessive adjective plays in English and Spanish. Research showed how this particular feature is obligatory in English, but not in Spanish, although it can be found in Spanish for purposes of emphasis or clarification. Possessive adjectives used with inalienable or alienable nouns are found in both languages and can be easily transferred from English into Spanish given its parallel functionality.

The quantitative analysis in chapter four revealed that there is a difference between generations when the possessive markers are used with either inalienable or alienable nouns. In inalienable contexts, the first generation tended to restrict the use of the
possessive adjective (PAI), whereas the second generation allowed it more frequently, 68% versus 32%. The second generation showed an additional feature to mark inalienable possession fulfilling the empty category of the article in Spanish. By contrast, the first generation does not show a preference, but more of a competition between possible forms. This result supports the idea of an intergenerational language variation. Participants who acquired their second language later in life present a more dynamic use of possessive markers, and their children, who grew up bilingual, tend to prefer possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns, just as in English.

Lastly, relevant external factors that seemed to be affecting the preference described above include: 1) the order in which the child was born in the family, 2) being born in a Spanish speaking country and having immigrated before school age, 3) having been raised in a mostly Latino neighborhood, and 4) belonging to families that allowed English use. All social factors noted above describe domains where both languages share importance, either privately or publicly. Therefore, my conclusion with regard to the second generation is that in more bilingual domains strong preferences for possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns (PAI) are reduced.

In the case of the use of a possessive marker in alienable contexts, the results showed that the options are in competition in the speech of both groups. The first generation confirmed a tendency for possessive adjectives (PAA) more than for articles (AA) with alienable nouns with a slight preference of 60% of possessive adjectives compared to a 40% of article determiners. On the other hand, the second generation’s result was the opposite; articles used with alienable nouns (AA) were more common with a 61% rate of use and a 39% use of possessive adjectives (PAA). Therefore, I conclude
that children raised bilingually use the possessive differently, according to the context of inalienable vs. alienable nouns. The second generation speakers tend to use more variation with alienable nouns with higher preference for possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns. At a rate of 46% of use of possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns (PAI) by parents, children were able to receive input of this form in the home domain. This pattern was reinforced by their contact with English, which increases its use. The case of possessive use with alienable nouns showed a great deal of variation; the children were using articles to mark possession, indicating that contact between English and Spanish in early bilinguals seemed to provide them with more alternatives to express possession. The important role that Spanish played within the different domains allowed the article to remain active in the possessive link.

Additionally, the second generation was not only processing the possessive adjective as a default variant for both languages, as could be expected after my previous analysis of the article as an empty category, but they also used the article actively with alienable nouns, fulfilling other grammatical functions while also establishing the possessive link.

Language contact may be a factor in the outcome since the form is acceptable in both languages and there are no issues of obvious syntactic incongruence. Transfer of possessive adjectives may occur with ease. However, dialect variation and dialect contact might also have played a role in the outcome. If certain Spanish dialects are already using possessive adjectives as specificity markers, as was found in studies by Orozco (2004), Hnat (2008), and Godenzzi (2010), then possessive adjectives would
remain as possible variants to express the possessive link, and those could be triggered by the syntactic agreement that exists between the languages.

Although there was not a monolingual control group in the current study, the use of the possessive adjective as a possessive marker is common in monolingual dialects, and results for the first generation showed a preference for possessive adjectives with alienable nouns and a competition between forms with inalienable nouns. This indicates that possessive adjectives are found in various Spanish dialects, and not only in U.S. Spanish. Therefore, the input received by the second generation in the use of possessive expression comes from Spanish dialect contact as well as English contact.

Moreover, cross tabulation results revealed that there were two social variables that consistently play a role in the outcome: community language and the language for communication in the household. These social variables increased the competition between variants with both inalienable and alienable nouns if the public and private domains had opposing language preferences. For example, if a mainly English-speaking community had a Spanish-speaking family residing within it that encouraged the use of Spanish in the household or, the opposite, if a mainly Spanish-speaking community had a Spanish-speaking family residing within it that allowed the use of English at home. Then it resulted in a more competitive use of possessive forms.

Lastly, the other two variants observed, nouns with an ambiguous inalienability reading and stressed possessive adjectives, did not show significant variation between generations. Both generations preferred possessive adjectives to mark the possessive link with nouns such as “tradition”, “language”, “morals”, and “culture”, putting emphasis on
the relationship. In the case of stressed possessive adjectives, those were rarely found in the speech of the second generation.

The focus of this dissertation with regard to the predicate possessive expression was to analyze the uses of the verb *tener*. Chapter two presented a review of research regarding the functionality of this verb in both languages, the fact that it is multifunctional in English and possessive limited in Spanish. The initial objective was to find if a possible expansion in the use of the verb *tener* could be observed in bilingual contexts, and if other verbs or possessive expressions could replace it by a process of “semantic bleaching”.

Different constructions for predicate possession were analyzed. The first one was the use of the verb *tener* with a possessive adjective and either an inalienable or alienable noun. In both generations, a tendency towards *tener + possessive adjective + alienable noun* was observed. These types of possessive constructions might be adding a semantic value to the utterance, which would be to clarify permanent versus temporary ownership. Attributive possession results showed co-existence of articles and possessive adjectives with alienable nouns; the difference marked by the presence of the verb *tener* in the utterance highlights not only the possessive link, but further marks ownership. Therefore, this variant was shown to be significant with alienable nouns, but not with inalienable nouns where the kin relationship, or the part of a whole link between possessor and possessum, is naturally established. Occurrences of *tener + possessive adjective + inalienable noun* are possessive redundant, whereas occurrences of *tener + possessive adjective + alienable noun* might be a result of ownership clarification.
First and second generations showed a preference for *tener* + possessive adjective with alienable nouns. The restriction that exists within Spanish grammar for possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns seemed to be present in the speech samples of multidialectal and intergenerational speakers when the verb *tener* is present. However, when linguistic factors were crossed with social ones, the data between generations revealed an increase in frequencies of using *tener* + possessive adjective + inalienable noun among first generation speakers who were fluent bilinguals and those second generation speakers for whom English was allowed in their homes. Therefore in domains where English and Spanish interacted actively more competition was observed.

The above results could not confirm any language contact effect because participants still restrict the use of possessive adjectives with inalienable nouns when accompanied by the verb *tener* and when possessive adjectives with alienable nouns are used in Spanish within contexts of clarification or emphasis. In order to further understand this preference for *tener* + possessive adjective + alienable noun, future research should be carried out to analyze each utterance separately and compare it to data from a monolingual speech community.

The second predicate variant analyzed was the use of the verb *tener* where *haber* was possible and vice versa. Although both verbs can be used interchangeably, the preference for one or the other may depend on discourse and contextual factors, and these two may be emphasizing possession or existence, which triggers the use of *tener* in the former and *haber* in the latter. The first generation uses the verb *tener* more often and the second generation prefers *haber*. I observed that this difference between generations was a result of the conversation topic. Parents for the most part were talking about specific
experiences lived by their children that turned into possessive relationships. This explains their frequent use of the verb tener. On the other hand, children were mostly describing home, neighborhoods and school environments while growing up, which explain their recurrent use of haber. My conclusion, after approaching both verbs from a possessive view, is that these verbs cannot be interchangeable without altering the semantics of the utterance. Therefore a binominal analysis cannot be done due to their function specific differences: possessive for tener and existential for haber.

The third predicate variant analyzed dealt with the frequency of the verb tener where other verbs or constructions implying possession were possible. The results revealed that within language domains where Spanish had a strong presence, more variety of possessive constructions was observed, and in general there was more variation if both languages had similar degrees of importance. The first generation revealed a slightly higher preference for tener for speakers where English had a strong presence: for professionals, college educated, residents in Anglo communities, and those with advanced English skills.

Initially, I suggested the possibility of an increase in the use of the verb tener in bilingual domains. Results revealed that such an increase was not significant among participants who grew up bilingual, and that other Spanish possessive constructions were still active within their linguistic repertoire. Social variables were not significant enough to arrive at any conclusion. It seems that the competition between forms in the first generation and the preference for other verbs in the second generation was closely related to discourse variation, and vocabulary proficiencies.
The last predicate variant observed was the frequency of an implicit possessive
via the usage of dative and accusative pronouns. Few tokens were found. Therefore, it
was impossible to draw significant conclusions. This construction occurred more
frequently among the first generation, and as was mentioned before, this could have been
a consequence of discourse topic: parents talking about their children, which would
trigger the variant in order to establish a kin possessive relationship.
Chapter 7: Conclusion
The objective of the present study was to describe the expression of possession in Spanish by two generations of speakers from various dialects. This study aimed to investigate the possibility of a change in progress in what pertains to this particular grammatical category as observed across two generations.

It has been discussed that in the case of English and Spanish possessives, great congruence is found. Grammatically, both languages share the same position for determinants. Attributive possession allows an unnoticeable exchange since grammars are not altered. On the other hand, with predicate possession there is a semantic constraint that limits the transfer of the verb “to have” / tener between the two languages and within similar linguistic contexts.

The particularities of the speakers analyzed in this dissertation also affected its outcome. The second generation included in the study had a strong presence of Spanish in either private or public domains while growing up. All presented oral proficiencies at the advanced level and were taking Spanish classes at college. This provided both languages with similar degrees of importance in various domains, and the use of Spanish became a tool to achieve a professional goal. The results regarding attributive possession presented a significant use of article determiners to mark possession with alienable nouns, and in spite of second generation speakers’ preference for possessive adjective determiners with inalienable nouns, the article is used as well in the same contexts. At the family level, parents versus children, the frequency of the variant confirmed a difference with regards to possessives with inalienable nouns, but not with alienable nouns, where competitive results were found for both generations. Concluding remarks concerning attributive possession are that great variation is found in the Spanish used in
New York urban areas. Bilingual speakers raised in bilingual domains, and coming from various Spanish dialects, and who study Spanish at college keep all the forms in their linguistic repertoire.

With regards to predicate possession, the manner in which data was collected for this feature presented limitations for its analysis. Parents and children varied in focus when talking about similar topics; therefore, utterances using the verbs tener, haber, and other verbs could not be analyzed as two parallel variants.

A future approach for the study of possessives in New York, which would provide a rich comparative study, is the inclusion of a monolingual control groups, preferably representing participants with a higher immigrant presence in New York, such as Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Mexicans, Ecuadorians, or Colombians. In addition, I believe it would be useful to include second generation participants who are not studying Spanish academically at college, for whom Spanish proficiencies may vary.

Methodologically, future research might also use data collection instruments exclusively designed with the possessive variant as a target along with a semi directed interview on topics that allow for natural speech narration, for example, descriptions of their own family pictures where the interviewer points to specific items in subject–object possessive relationship, or purposely generates specific questions dealing with particular inalienable or alienable possessions and the verb tener. It is important to have the conversation flow and to not make the participants aware of the language they are using. Therefore, the use of their own family album versus random pictures keeps the speakers linguistically less conscious, thus providing authentic possessive tokens.
The fact that Hispanic immigration has rapidly grown grants adequate environments for interaction, not only among speakers from various communities, but also from different generations. The constant flow of immigrant Spanish speakers and some social practices observed at the family level, such as closeness to extended family and preference for closed social networks, allow for ideal language studies describing the varieties of Spanish found in multidialectal and multilingual contexts within the United States.
1 Velázquez Castillo (1999) presents an interesting analysis of the Body-Part EP constructions where she explains how the dative already subsumes the concept of possession; therefore, possessive adjectives are not necessary to establish the possessive relation: “El prisionero le buscó la mirada” le is already implying the possessive relationship of the accusative object, whereas “El prisionero buscó la mirada” leaves an empty category that does not clarify the possessive relationship with the accusative object “la mirada”.

2 Heine (1997) presents a detailed explanation of “possessive schemas” in chapter two of his book. All the examples illustrating the different schemas in the current work are part of the data collected for the purpose of this research.

3 In certain areas of Latin America, the subject pronoun “vos”, second person singular informal, is found. There is no possessive adjective specifically used with this subject pronoun. Whenever the possessive is required, the forms of “tu” are used, for example: “vos querés la casa tuya” or “vos querés tu casa” (you want your own house or your want your house).

4 Hnat (2008: 63) elaborates further stating that the redundant su is becoming more common among middle class speakers, and that it is used when the speaker perceives a close relationship between possessor and possessum.

5 This approach to the analysis of the verb “to have” from lexical to functional head has become a shift of focus for several researchers in their task to compare the various functions between “have”, “be”, and “there” sentences (Dikken, 1997).

6 Kempchinsky (1995) discusses extensively the relationship between possession and existence in Romance languages using examples in French, Spanish, and Italian. Dikken (1997) touches on some introductory remarks in the connection between “have” sentences and existential constructions citing Kayne (1993) and Hornstein (1994), where ambiguity is argued within “there” sentences, and a need for “have” structure comes about to clarify the relationship between possessor and possessum, or spatial reading versus integral part of a whole.

7 Velázquez-Castillo (1999:77) defines the same type of examples as “attributive tener”. Her example “Tenía las piernas delgadas” (he/she had the thin legs) presents a body-part term directly involved in some activity or state where a human possessor is portrayed as the primary experiencer of the activity or state and the body-part as a descriptive attribute.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Generation Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year at College</th>
<th>Birth Order</th>
<th>Birth Place</th>
<th>1st Social Network</th>
<th>2nd Social Network</th>
<th>Language at Home</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FJOTLENF Jr Oldest U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Arg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSGTMMNSF So Younger U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Hon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFOCMNMDF Fr Oldest L.A.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJGTLMNRM Jr Younger U.S.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSOCEMNE M So Oldest L.A.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Ecu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGTLMYM M So Younger U.S.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Mex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSGTLMNSF So Younger U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>El Sal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSGTLMNR F So Younger U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFOCLMNHF Fr Oldest L.A.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Hon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJUTLMEF Jr Only Child U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Only Child</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>Ecu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSOCLMYDF So Oldest L.A.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJOTMMNGF Jr Oldest U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish / Gallego</td>
<td>Spa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJOTMMYRF Jr Oldest U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJGTMNNCM Jr Younger U.S.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSUTMNCF So Only Child U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Only Child</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJOTLNCF Jr Oldest U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSOTLMYRF So Oldest U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Biographical Information of First Generation Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st generation Participant</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Community of Residence</th>
<th>English Skills</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Language at Home</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEUFYE</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Own Business</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>Ecu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEUFNE</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Own Business</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Ecu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEWCNM</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Mex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEWCNM</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Mex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUOND</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUOND</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUONC</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWCYC</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLWOYR</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Own Business</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLWOYR</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLWOYR</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUOYD</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Own Business</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEUONE</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Ecu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEWCNE</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Ecu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWCYA</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>Arg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWONA</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Arg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLWOYR</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLWOYR</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>P.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUCND</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUCND</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEUCNH</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Hon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEWOYC</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Own Business</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEUFNG</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Spanish / Gallego</td>
<td>Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEUFNC</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEUONS</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>El Sal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 First Generation Speakers Letter of Consent

Dear Parent,

I am a doctoral student of the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures (LLC) at the University at Albany and a faculty member of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at the State College at Oneonta. I am conducting research about the use of Spanish as a heritage language. Therefore I would like to invite you to participate in this research project that explores growing up bilingual/bicultural within the home and the school contexts.

You will provide information through an audiotape-recorded interview that will explore your experiences as an immigrant parent raising up your children in the United States. The interview will last approximately one hour and it takes place in your home or any other place that you consider to be convenient.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. It will not affect your child’s studies at the College. Recordings will be saved and kept secure. I will protect your privacy in the future and during the study. There is no risk anticipated, or sensitive questions that could harm you in any manner. However, if at some point of the interview you feel intimidated by any negative memory, you may avoid it totally or decline participation. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the Office of Research Compliance at 800-365-9139 or orc@uamail.albany.edu. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board Chair at Oneonta (607) 436-3346.

Your signature on this consent letter indicates that you give permission for each part of the study (data collection, analysis and results’ presentation at academic institutions or conferences). Please contact me (see below) if you have questions, concerns or would like more background information on the project and results. You may contact my research advisor as well, Dr. Sayahi, at 518-442-4153.

My Phone: 607-436-3242. My E-mail: montoymc@oneonta.edu My Office: 516 Fitzelle Hall Maria Cristina Montoya. M. A.

Professor of Foreign Languages and Literatures SUNY Oneonta Date: __________________________

__________________________     _______________________
Print name of participants     Participants’ signature
Appendix 4 First Generation Speakers Personal Data Base and Interview Questions

Parent’s personal database:

Please complete the following general information circling or writing the appropriate information:

1. Are you? 
   mother  father  other:____________ 

2. Age range? 
   35 to 45  46 to 60  more than  60 

3. Level of formal education: 
   elementary  secondary  some college courses  
   associate degree  bachelor degree  master  doctorate 

4. If you have college education, please describe the field: 
   humanities  science  mathematics  education  arts  
   Other:___________________ 

5. Profession? (be as specific as possible) 
   worker (what kind?) 
   service employee (cleaning, health services) 
   technician (what kind?)_________________ 
   professional (what kind?)_________________ 
   do not work 
   works at home (what kind?)________________ 
   own business(What kind?) _________________ 
   retired 
   other:_________________

6. Language spoken at home with husband / wife: 
   English  Spanish  Both 

7. Language spoken at home with children: 
   English  Spanish  Both 

8. Language spoken at home with other family members: 
   English  Spanish  Both 

9. Language spoken at home with others (friends): 
   English  Spanish  Both
Parents’ Oral Interview Questions:
1. Where are you from originally?
2. How many people are there in your family?
3. How old were you when you came into the United States?
4. Were you married before or after coming to the U.S.?
5. Were your children born in your country of origin or in the U.S.?
6. Where have you lived since you arrived in the U.S.?
7. Where do you live now? Describe the neighborhood (population according to ethnicity, languages spoken, urban, suburban, or rural)
8. How is your neighborhood? Is it safe to raise a family? How about the schools?
9. Did you help your children with homework while they were growing up?
10. Who were your children’s friends while attending school? What kind of friends did you prefer?
11. What is your opinion about your children’s education?
12. Is there a special or important person in your nuclear or extended family that influences or participates in your home dynamics and decisions?
13. What do you think is an important Hispanic family value?
14. Do you find differences between the Hispanic family and the U.S. family? Please describe…
15. Do you speak, read, and/or write English?
16. Which language do you use with your husband/wife at home?
17. Which language predominates at home? And in which situations? Has it been always the same or has the language use changed over the time?
18. Which language did your children learn first?
19. Did you teach your children to pray? In what language?
20. Is the television that you watch at home in English or Spanish?
21. Do you listen to radio or music at home in Spanish or English?
22. What kind of food is usually prepared at home?
23. Do you want your children to preserve the Spanish language? Why?
24. What have you done for the purpose of your children maintaining the Spanish language?
25. What has been more effective to make them maintain Spanish language and culture?
26. What do you think of the bilingual or English as a Second Language programs in public schools?
27. Do you consider your children bilingual? Bicultural?
28. Why is it positive to be bilingual / bicultural?
29. Why is it negative to be bilingual / bicultural?

30. Have you preferred at any time that your children do not speak Spanish, only English?

31. Do you think that your children have rejected speaking Spanish at some point within their lives? When? Describe

32. Being of Hispanic origin caused you any trouble or obstacle for you in the U.S.?

33. Being bilingual or bicultural caused any trouble in schools or in other contexts for your children?

34. Which do you think is your children’s nationality / country identity? Describe

35. How would you describe your children ethnically?

36. What things make your children from the U.S. or from your country of origin?

37. How many times have you taken your children to your native country? For how long?

38. What do you remember about their impressions and perceptions about your native country?

39. What do you appreciate, enjoy, like the most from the Hispanic or the U.S. culture?

40. Compare the two cultures and describe some differences.

41. Why did you immigrate to the U.S.?

42. Where do you think it is easier to raise a family, in your native country or in the U.S.?

43. Which traditions do you maintain in your home from your native culture? Why do you want to preserve these traditions?

44. Did you influence your child’s decision to study Spanish academically at college?

45. Why do you think that your child decided to study Spanish in college?

46. What does he/she mention about Spanish classes in college?

47. Now that your child studies Spanish, has the language usage changed at home? Does he/she use more Spanish with you or siblings?

48. Do you think that your child will use Spanish in his/her future career? Is he/she prepared to use Spanish professionally?

49. Do you think that your children have a special societal mission or responsibility with the Hispanic community in the U.S. by being second generation Hispanics?
Appendix 5 Second Generation Speakers Letter of Consent

Dear Student:

I am a doctoral student of the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures (LLC) at the University at Albany, and a faculty member of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at the State College at Oneonta. I am conducting research about the use of Spanish as a heritage language. Therefore I would like to invite you to participate in this research project that explores growing up bilingual/bicultural within the home and the school contexts.

The study focuses on your experiences as a student in a Spanish, bilingual or English as a Second Language class, and your parents’ involvement in your bilingual/bicultural upbringing. You will provide information through an audiotape-recorded interview that will explore your experiences and appreciations of being a bilingual student. The interview lasts about an hour and thirty minutes. The interview will take place in my office or the language laboratory at the College at Oneonta. After the interview, if you agree, I would like to meet and interview your parents as well. The interview with your parents can take place either at their home or at the College during one of their campus visits.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. It will not affect grades or class standings.

You are free to refuse to participate or to stop taking part at any time. Recordings will be saved and kept secure. I will protect your privacy in the future and during the study. There is no risk anticipated, or sensitive questions that could harm you in any manner. However, if at some point of the interview you feel intimidated by any negative memory during your school years, you may avoid it totally or decline participation. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the Office of Research Compliance at 800-365-9139 or orc@uamail.albany.edu. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board Chair at Oneonta (607) 436-3346.

Your signature on this consent letter indicates that you give permission for each part of the study (data collection, analysis and results presentation at academic institutions or conferences). Please contact me (see below) if you have questions, concerns or would like more background information on the project and results. You may contact my research advisor as well, Dr. Sayahi, at 518-442-4153. My Phone: 607-436-3242. My E-mail: montoym@oneonta.edu My Office: 516 Fitzelle Hall. Maria Cristina Montoya.

Print name of participant

Participant signature

Professor of Foreign Languages and Literatures SUNY Oneonta Date: ________________
Appendix 6 Second Generation Speakers Personal Data Base and Interview Questions

Personal Database:

1. Name: ___________________ Gender: F  M
2. Place of birth: ____________
3. Origin (Parents’ native country) ____________________
4. Age: ______________
5. Place where you currently live in New York? _______________
6. Place where you lived while childhood: ________________
7. Place where you lived while being a teenager: ________________
8. Year at college: ______________
9. Major at college: ______________ Minor at college_________
10. Father’s educational level:
    elementary       secondary       some college courses
    associate         bachelor        master        doctorate
11. Mother’s educational level
    elementary       secondary       some college courses
    associate         bachelor        master        doctorate
12. Father’s profession: ______________
13. Mother’s profession: ______________
14. Languages spoken at home with father:
    English       Spanish       Both
15. Languages spoken at home with mother:
    English       Spanish       Both
16. Language spoken at home with siblings:
    English       Spanish       Both
17. Language spoken at home with other family members:
    English       Spanish       Both
18. Language spoken in the community where your parents live now: ____________
19. Language spoken in the community where you lived as a child: ____________
20. Language spoken in the community where you lived as an adolescent: ____________
Oral Interview:

Generalities
1. Where were you born?
2. How many people are there in your family?
3. Do you have a special person in your nuclear or extended family that you talk with mostly or who influences your decisions?
4. What is your neighborhood like now (parents’ home)? Describe it… (ethnic population, languages spoken)
5. What was your neighborhood like while growing up?
6. Did you have many friends when you were a child or adolescent or did you spend most of the time with family?
7. What was the ethnicity of your friends while growing up?
8. Do you have many friends in college? What is their ethnicity? Do you have Hispanic friends?
9. Do you talk to your Hispanic friends in Spanish?
10. What do you do in your free time?

School Experience
11. What were the elementary and secondary schools that you attended like? (public, private, religious)
12. How much Spanish did you know upon entrance to elementary school?
   native fluency       did not know other    good, but not as a native
   poor               none
13. How much English did you know upon entrance to elementary school:
   native fluency       did not know other    good, but not as a native
   poor               none
14. Did you experience a bilingual class? __________
15. Did you experience an English as a Second Language class? __________
   Years in the Bilingual program: __________
   Years in the ESL program: __________
   Age at beginning of the Bilingual or ESL program: __________
   School grades while in the bilingual or ESL programs: __________
16. Who decided that you should be in a bilingual or ESL class?
   a) parents  b) school teachers  c) school administrators  d) school policies  e)other
17. Did you have any type of evaluation before assigned into the program?
18. What type of evaluation: written, oral?
19. Were your parents informed about the placement in a bilingual or ESL program?
20. What did your parents think of the bilingual/ESL class?
21. What was the background of your classmates in the bilingual/ESL class?
22. Did your classmates know more or less English than you did?
23. Were there, in the bilingual or ESL class, immigrant students or heritage students born in the U.S.? Did you perceive any difference among them?
24. What was the nationality or cultural background of your bilingual/ESL teachers?
25. What languages did your teacher speak in class, to what amount and for which purposes?
26. Did your teacher tell you at some point to stop using Spanish? What was his/her argument to do so?
27. When you were placed in a bilingual/ESL class, did you feel less capable than other students in your school?
28. Did you think that the bilingual/ESL class was a remedial class? Was it a step necessary to get into the monolingual class?
29. Did you feel “special” in your school? In what sense?
30. Did you feel you were disadvantaged or less capable because you came from a Hispanic home environment linguistically and culturally? Yes or No. Did somebody tell you this? Has this situation changed now that you are at college?
31. On the other hand, did experiencing another culture and language make you feel advantaged over monolingual students? Did you think this at that time during elementary or secondary school or do you think this now?
32. In school were you categorized as a special type of student? For example LEP (limited English proficient)
33. Was there any type of contact between your parents and teachers?
   Yes  No   how and when?
34. Did your teachers tell your parents to not talk Spanish at home?
   Yes  No   what was your parents’ response?
35. Did your parents try to speak English at home to you? Why?
36. Where were you able to use Spanish freely?
   a) at home b) with friends  c) at school (where)  d) everywhere
37. Where were you able to use English freely?
   a) at home b) with friends  c) at school (where)  d) everywhere
38. Were you punished at some point for using Spanish?
   Yes  No  (if yes explain)
Spanish academic experience:

39. Did you take Spanish classes in elementary or secondary school?

40. What was your Spanish teachers’ nationality?

41. Were these classes designed for native or bilingual students only or as Spanish as a second language for English monolinguals?

42. Why did you take this class? Required or elective

43. Was it beneficial to take the Spanish class? How?

44. What was the level of difficulty?

45. How many Spanish courses at the college level have you taken? Describe

46. Why did you decide to study Spanish at the college?

47. How was your Spanish proficiency level upon entrance to the Spanish college classes?

48. What do you enjoy or find interesting in Spanish college courses?

49. What is your main goal by taking these college Spanish classes? And how does the class help you achieve that goal?

50. Do you think that the main objective for having registered in a Spanish course at college has changed since you started?

51. Do you think that you will use Spanish in your future career?

52. Has studying Spanish at college changed the communication dynamics experienced at home with your parents or siblings? Do you mention to them what you have learned about Hispanic history, culture or language?

53. Has studying Spanish at college changed your network of friends? Do you speak Spanish to your friends?

54. Has studying Spanish has modified some of your previous ideologies about language? Or beliefs about people in general, knowledge about cultures or Hispanic values inherited from your parents?
Bilingual and Bicultural Experience:

55. How many languages do you know?

56. How do you consider the Spanish language?
   a) mother tongue     b) second language     c) heritage language
   d) foreign language

57. How do you consider the English language?
   a) mother tongue     b) second language     c) heritage language     d) foreign language

58. You use Spanish to express:
   a) affections     b) familiar topics, private at home     c) anger     d) cordiality
   e) respect     f) work related topics or in public     g) academics
   h) for daily survival     other: ______________________

59. You use the English language to express:
   a) affections     b) familiar topics, private at home     c) anger     d) cordiality
   e) respect     f) work related topics or in public     g) academics
   h) for daily survival     other: ______________________

60. Do your parents know the languages you know?

61. Which language do you speak to your parents now?

62. Which language do you speak to your siblings now?

63. Which language(s) do you use predominately in the community where you live with your
    parents (not in Oneonta) Examples: the local store, with neighbors…

64. With whom do you speak only Spanish?

65. With whom do you speak only English?

66. Which language did you use with your family while growing up?

67. Were there specific situations when you had to speak in Spanish?

68. In what language did you learn to pray?

69. In what language do you pray now? In what language do you talk to God?

70. Which language is more difficult? What aspect? Why?

71. Do you want to maintain your parents’ language? Why?

72. What do you do to maintain your Spanish?

73. Do you want to maintain Spanish with your future children? Why?

74. How are you going to preserve Spanish with your children? What things would you do
    similar or different from what your parents did with you?

75. Do you consider yourself bilingual? Explain.

76. Do you consider yourself bicultural? Explain.
77. Did you reject Spanish at some point in your life?
78. Has being bilingual or bicultural caused you any trouble in your life?
79. What is your nationality?
80. What makes you a United States citizen and what makes you of Hispanic origin?
81. How many times have you traveled to a Spanish speaking country and for how long?
82. Do you have any personal contact with anybody in your parents’ country of origin?
83. What do you remember from your trips to a Spanish speaking country?
84. What do you enjoy the most from the Hispanic culture?
85. What do you enjoy the most from the U.S. culture?
86. Would you like to live in a Spanish speaking country? Which of the things that you already know could help you survive there?
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