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ABSTRACT

The objective of this dissertation is to contribute to the growing body of research on sociolinguistic variation of final liquids in Caribbean Spanish in a language and dialectal contact situation. To achieve that objective, this study analyzes the Spanish of Dominicans in the New York Metropolitan Area. The dissertation has two main goals. The first is to describe language attitudes among Dominicans in New York. Data extracted from questionnaires are analyzed to show how Dominicans evaluate their varieties of Spanish and those of others. Additionally, the dissertation looks at whether inter- and intra-group interactions affect language attitudes. The second goal of the study is to describe sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/ and /l/ in New York Dominican Spanish. Using data extracted from sociolinguistic interviews, the dissertation uses quantitative analysis to consider a variety of social and linguistic factors that play a role in the variation of final liquids. Social variables include gender, birthplace, region of origin in the Dominican Republic, age at the time of the interview (age group), age at arrival in the United States of foreign-born (generation in the US), and years residing in the United States. The linguistic variables analyzed are type of word, environment of the syllable, following feature, and syllable stress. Of particular interest to the study is determining to what degree dialectal contact with both Dominican and non-Dominican varieties of Spanish shapes variation and language attitudes among Dominicans in New York.

The results of the study show that the language ideologies that contribute to the formation of language attitudes among Dominicans in New York come from a variety of sources, some of which are formed within the New York Dominican Community, while others combine with and/or stem from Latin America. In terms of variation of final liquids, final /l/ is much more resistant with maintenance being preferred in the community. Final /ɾ/ showed variation across
all extralinguistic and linguistic factors. Some trends in the data such as an overall decrease in maintenance of final /ɾ/ in later immigrant generations in the United States and especially among men are in line with findings within the current body of research of sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/. Other patterns emerge from my data that go against overall trends such as more maintenance of final /ɾ/ among women from generation 1.5, which challenges the idea of maintenance /ɾ/ decreasing across later immigrant generations in the United States. This dissertation shows that the sociolinguistic variation of final liquids in Dominican Spanish is influenced by a variety of social and linguistic factors. The study also demonstrates that in order to understand sociolinguistic variation of final liquids among Dominicans in the United States, it is imperative to consider the specific sociolinguistic environment of the community and its members.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Dominicans make up one of the largest Spanish-speaking groups in the New York Metropolitan Area (Begard 2014). As a community, Dominicans display a high degree of ethnolinguistic vitality, which is inextricably linked to feelings of Spanish being integral to Dominican identity (Toribio 2000a, 2000b, 2000c). Furthermore, Dominicans in New York are strongly linked socially and economically to the Dominican Republic further demonstrating the transnational nature of the community (Dicker 2006). In addition to Dominicans, New York City is also home to various Spanish-speaking populations (Otheguy and Zentella 2012).

Dominicans in New York City find themselves in a unique sociolinguistic environment, in which they have three main points of language and dialectal contact. Firstly, there is contact between Dominican Spanish and English. Language contact phenomena such as borrowing and code-switching have been attested in the literature to occur especially in contexts where there is a high degree of bilingualism across multiple generations. The second point of contact occurs between different dialects of Dominican and non-Dominican Spanish. Instances of divergence or convergence can occur at the syntactic, phonological, or lexical level (Escobar and Potowski 2015). The last and most constant point of contact is that between various Dominican dialects of Spanish. The Dominican dialects in New York City, like non-Dominican dialects, fall along a linguistic stratification (Pountain 2016). This stratification, along with the unique sociolinguistic context in which the dialects come into contact, plays a role in the degree of dialectal levelling that may manifest itself in the Dominican community. In the case of Dominican dialects, two stand out among the four that have been described, that of Santo Domingo, the capital city, and the dialect of the Cibao region, commonly stigmatized for the vocalization of final /l/ and /ɾ/. 
Despite a decline in recent years, these stigmatized features are still in use and are strongly associated with the region (Reyes 2020).

The question then is how do we examine these points of contact? In terms of English and non-other Dominican varieties, it is useful to look at the language attitudes Dominicans hold towards language maintenance in the United States. In addition to feelings towards Spanish use, one can gain insight into the dynamics of language contact by examining Dominicans’ assessments of Dominican and non-Dominican varieties of Spanish. To look at contact with other Dominican dialects and get an overall picture of the state of New York Dominican Spanish, we can analyze variation of dialectal features. One such feature is how final /l/ and /ɾ/ are realized between speakers from the two main dialect zones, the Santo Domingo region and El Cibao.

The current study describes the sociolinguistic variation of final /l/ and /ɾ/ among Dominicans in the New York Metropolitan area. Using a corpus of 26 recorded interviews, the study identifies the various phonetic realizations of final /l/ and /ɾ/: maintenance (tap or trill), lateralization, rhotacism, vocalization, deletion, or the retroflex variant. Participants represent the Santo Domingo and Cibao dialects across different age groups and sociolinguistic generations. Social and linguistic factors are examined using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Social factors include gender, birthplace, region of origin in the Dominican Republic, age at the time of the interview, age at arrival, and years in the United States. Linguistic factors analyzed are type of word, environment of the syllable, following feature, and syllable stress. Using data gathered from an administered questionnaire, the study also looks at language attitudes and ideologies that shape language use in the Dominican community in New York.
The dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter 2 serves as an overview of studies on Dominican Spanish, both in the Dominican Republic and the United States. It first situates Spanish in the Dominican Republic within the greater context of Spanish in the Caribbean. With that in mind, the chapter then examines regional and sociolinguistic variation within the Dominican Republic and its various dialect zones, with special attention being paid to the Santo Domingo and El Cibao regions. The chapter also contextualizes Spanish in the United States in terms of English and dialectal contact. The focus of the chapter then moves to Dominican Spanish in the Northeast, particularly its presence in the New York Metropolitan Area. The following section discusses the sociolinguistic variation of final liquids in other Caribbean dialects (Cuban and Puerto Rican). Lastly, the chapter discusses the role language attitudes and identity play in the maintenance of Dominican Spanish.

Chapter 3 describes the methods used for data collection, coding, and analysis. The chapter begins with presenting the research objectives and questions guiding the dissertation. The following section provides detailed demographic information about the participants. The chapter ends with a description of the factor groups which are used for data analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the qualitative analysis of attitudinal data extracted from participants’ responses to the questionnaire. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first focuses on participants’ perceptions and attitudes about Dominican Spanish. The second part discusses what participants believe to be the “best” and “worst” varieties of Spanish.

Chapter 5 offers a quantitative analysis of the phonetic data extracted from the interviews. I provide a description of the overall frequency of the variants of /ɾ/ followed by an analysis of social then linguistic factors. I later discuss the variation of final /l/ among the participants.
Given the stability of final /l/ in the data set, I provide a description of the overall frequency of final /l/ along with an analysis of the variable based on region of origin.

Chapter 6 reintroduces the research questions from Chapter 3 to frame the overall results of the study. Additionally, the chapter considers the findings of the dissertation, while also reexamining the variables used in data analysis. Folded into the discussion of the findings, the chapter considers the limitations of the study and describes implications for future research.
CHAPTER 2: DOMINICAN SPANISH: THE MAINLAND AND THE UNITED STATES

2.1. Introduction

Studies on Spanish in the United States often hypothesize that immigrants bring their varieties of Spanish, the reference lect, from the country of origin and that their children acquire a similar bilingual lect\(^1\) (Ortman and Stevens 2008; Otheguy and Zentella 2012). Thus, in order to understand the behavior of Dominican Spanish in New York, we must contextualize it sociolinguistically, first within the Spanish-speaking Caribbean and second, within the United States. The first half of the chapter explores studies on Caribbean and Dominican dialectology, ending with more recent studies on Dominican sociolinguistics, specifically on final /l/ and /ɾ/. The second half of the chapter discusses Spanish in the United States, its historical background and general linguistic phenomena found across various sociolinguistic regions. Next, the chapter focuses on Dominican Spanish in the US, how it fits within its American context and what distinguishes it from varieties spoken by other Spanish-speaking communities. The following section of the chapter describes studies on sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/ of other Caribbean dialects in the United States. The chapter ends with an exploration of language attitudes among Dominicans in The United States.

2.2 The Dominican Republic

The Dominican Republic is located in the Caribbean Sea on the island of Hispaniola, which it shares with Haiti to the west. Christopher Columbus landed on Hispaniola in 1492 and the Dominican Republic became the first Spanish colony of the Americas. Along with Cuba and

---

\(^1\) Reference lect is a term used by Otheguy and Zentella (2012: 10) to describe Spanish spoken in Latin America or by those immigrants who recently arrived in the United States (less than 5 years). This term is used along with “bilingual lect”, which refers to the Spanish of those Latin-American born immigrants with substantial time in the U.S. or those who were raised in the United States.
Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic was one of the first colonies where there was contact between Europeans, the indigenous Taino Indians, and African slaves. Unlike its Spanish-speaking Antillean neighbors, the Dominican Republic has additional points of contact with Haitian Creole (Kreyòl) along the Haitian border (Bullock and Toribio 2009).

![Map of the Dominican Republic](https://www.cia.gov/static/dd53ee86daf0ce5efa44350c6953e95c/DomRepPhysiography.jpg)

Figure 2.1 Map of the Dominican Republic

### 2.3 Caribbean Spanish

Dialectologists place the Dominican Republic in the Caribbean dialect zone (Lipski 1996; López Morales 1992). Approaches to the classification of the dialect zone include the following criteria: a) geographic location of the country b) indigenous and/or African substrate influence c)
the inland vs. coastal dialects dichotomy d) phonological features e) morpho-syntactic phenomena and f) lexicon. It is the combination and interplay of these criteria that characterize the Caribbean dialectal zone and distinguish it from other dialect zones. These distinctions can be seen in its phonetic, morpho-syntactic, and lexical features. For example, at the phonetic level, Caribbean dialects are at a more advanced stage of final consonant weakening (/l/, /ɾ/, /s/, /d/.) (López Morales 1992). On the morpho-syntactic level, we find the frequent use of overt personal pronouns and the lack of inversion of the subject and verb in interrogative sentences, for example “¿Qué tú quieres?” instead of “¿Qué quieres (tú)?”.

Beneath the superficial homogeneity of linguistic features in the Caribbean lie significant differences between the dialects. Alba (1995: 42) points out “[los lingüistas] suponen que tales procesos están presentes en las tres islas con la misma proporción y que el vocabulario arcaico, indígena, etc. está integrado por las mismas unidades”3. The degree of influence and the manifestation of extra-Hispanic influences vary from dialect to dialect. For example, the words for ‘pigeon pea’ in the Dominican Republic guandú(l) and Puerto Rico gandul are the result of African influence with slight differences in pronunciation (Lipski 1996: 353, 362). In addition to Africanisms, Taino influence can be found in words such as ají (pepper) and guanábana (soursop), reflecting a history of contact in the Dominican Republic (Toribio 2000b: 253).

### 2.3.1 Dialect Variation in the Caribbean

Research has shown that final liquids /l/ and /ɾ/ are “subject to both sociolinguistic differentiation and regional variation in the Dominican Republic” (Lipski 2008: 136). It is necessary to discuss sociolinguistic variation in the Caribbean and how socio-phonetic variation

---

3 “[linguists] assume that such processes are present in the three islands with the same numbers and that archaic and indigenous vocabulary are integrated in the same way”.
fits within what we know about Caribbean dialectology. While the variables /l/ and /ɾ/ are similar in their variants they are, in fact, the result of different phonetic processes⁴. Alba (2004) notes that speakers from both Latin America and Spain also confuse or alternate between the two features. General examples include: falda → [farda] and parte [palte] (85).

Other Caribbean dialects demonstrate geographic and sociolinguistic variation in the pronunciation of final liquids (Lipski 1996; Alfaraz 2000). Regional dialects in Cuba distinguish themselves by the presence or absence of liquid assimilation: falda → [fadda] (Alfaraz 2007). Assimilation is associated with the western region of Cuba (Pinar del Río, Havana, Matanzas) with the phenomenon decreasing as one moves towards the East. In terms of sociolinguistic variation, Alfaraz (2007) shows that the lateralization of final /ɾ/ in Cuban Spanish is associated with gender, with men producing the non-standard variant more frequently and women avoiding socially marked forms. Studies also document that /l/ is more stable than /ɾ/, with the latter subject to more influence from social and linguistic factors (Alba 2004; Alfaraz 2000; Centeno 2015).

Puerto Rico, given its small size and more developed infrastructure, has undergone a demographic shift, with the population being concentrated in urban zones. The change from rural to mainly urban populations has all but eliminated Puerto Rico’s geographic variation, giving way to social stratification as a more salient means of differentiation (Lipski 1996: 350). Stigmatized linguistic phenomena associated with rural speech (perro → [peXo]) and lower social classes (gordo → [goldo]) are more common among men than woman (López Morales 1992: 63, 119). López Morales argues that women are more aware of the social value of linguistic features and are thus less likely and inclined to use non-standard features.

⁴ Weakening vs. lateralization vs. rhotacization.
In order to understand final liquid variation in the Caribbean, it is useful to provide some background about its most variable feature. López Morales (1992) describes the following general possibilities for final /ɾ/ production:

1. Alveolar tap \textit{porque}→[porke]
2. Fricative \textit{porque}→[poʃke]\(^5\)
3. Aspiration \textit{porque}→[pohke]
4. Assimilation \textit{porque}→[pokke]
5. Lateralization \textit{porque}→[polke]
6. Deletion \textit{porque}→[poØke]

The standard prescribes the alveolar tap, but the fricative is also permitted given it is a result of coda weakening, which is typical of the region (López Morales 1992: 100). In addition to the common alveolar tap variant, the alveolar trill [ɾ] can also occur in coda position especially when used for emphasis: \textit{arte}→a[r]te, \textit{amor}→amo[r] (Hualde 2005: 182). For this reason, along with the possibility of stylistic variation during the sociolinguistic interviews, I considered the trill as a possible variant in this dissertation.

### 2.3.2 Early Studies on Dominican Spanish

Studies on Dominican Spanish investigate how the dialect distinguishes itself qualitatively and, more recently, quantitatively from other varieties of Caribbean Spanish. Initial studies on Caribbean Spanish are qualitative, lacking empirical data. One of the first in this tradition was Henríquez Ureña’s 1940 seminal study. His was one of the first to provide linguistic data on the dialect. The study was general, exploring various aspects of Spanish in the

---

\(^5\) López Morales (1992) used this symbol to designate a fricative. Today this symbol has come to designate palatal lateral approximant (Hualde 2005: xxii).
Dominican Republic such as its history, morphology, syntax, toponyms, etc. However, given the qualitative nature of the study, one must note that the conclusions drawn are general and impressionistic (Alba 1990: 30). Nonetheless, this leads to a series of fundamental studies on Dominican Spanish that contribute to the field and provide a basis for future research.

Henríquez Ureña (1940) draws parallels between features found in Andalucía with those found in the Dominican Republic:

> El debilitamiento o caída de las consonantes en final de sílaba, salvo la n, hecho general del español, pero especialmente avanzado en Andalucía (en el habla popular de las Antillas ha avanzado más que en Andalucía la caída de la s); los trastornos de la l y la r (unificación, aspiración, nasalización, asimilación a consonante siguiente, vocalización en i); entre los campesinos, la conservación de la antigua h aspirada (165-166).

In addition to its inheritance from Spain and substrate influences, Spanish in the Dominican Republic further distinguished itself from other varieties of Spanish due to its relative isolation from Spain over time as the colonial power started to focus on its other more lucrative colonies (Lipski 1996: 360-361; Alba 2004: 17).

In terms of final /l/ and /ɾ/, Henríquez Ureña (1940: 148-149) offers 6 variants:

1) An intermediate sound between /l/ and /ɾ/: \textit{alma}→[ arma]

---

6 Alba (1990) stresses that Henríquez Ureña’s (1940) study, albeit invaluable to the field of Dominican studies, contains findings that today may be obsolete due to 1) the age of the data with the data collection taking places between 1935-1936 and 2) the conclusions are not supported by empirical data.

7 See Willis (2006) and Bradley (2006) for phonetic studies on rhotics in Dominican Spanish and hypercorrective /s/. See Bullock, Toribio and Amengual et al. (2014) for details on intrusive /s/.

8 “The weakening or deletion of final consonants, except /n/, a general fact in Spanish, but especially advanced in Andalusia (in popular speech final /s/ deletion has advanced more in the Antilles than in Andalusia); the changes that /l/ and /ɾ/ undergo (unification, aspiration, nasalization, assimilation to the following consonant, vocalization to [i], the conservation of archaic [h] aspiration”.
2) For /ɾ/, aspiration: carne\(\rightarrow\)kahne

3) For /ɾ/, aspiration plus nasalization: mejor\(\rightarrow\)mexoh⁹

4) For both /l/ and /ɾ/, assimilation resulting in gemination: carne\(\rightarrow\)kanne

5) Deletion at the end of the word: cárcel\(\rightarrow\)karseØ

6) Vocalization of final liquids: algo\(\rightarrow\)aigo

These findings would be a point of departure for further studies on Dominican Spanish, as the theoretical frameworks and methodologies shift from qualitative to more quantitative ones.

The next phase of studies on Dominican Spanish takes a geolinguistic approach. Hoch and Hayes (2010) define geolinguistics as “an interdisciplinary field that often incorporates language maps depicting spatial patterns of language location or the results of processes that led to language change (23)”. Researchers can create isoglosses of linguistic features, which can show diatopic, diastratic, and diaphasic differences (Ortiz López 2016: 1). Some initial studies on Dominican Spanish include Navarro Tomás (1956) where he explores a rural variety of Dominican Spanish and Morel Elercia (1974) who looks at speakers from Santo Domingo. One of the more significant studies from this wave is Jiménez Sabater’s 1975 study on Spanish throughout the entire Dominican Republic. He conducted surveys and interviews as part of his data collection and methodology. Using his data, he created isoglosses of certain syntactic (ello hay), lexical (harinear vs llovizar¹⁰), and phonetic (final liquid pronunciation) features in the Dominican Republic. Jiménez Sabater’s work would come to serve as the foundation for future studies on dialects in the Dominican Republic.

---

⁹ In Henríquez Ureña’s example, the [oh] represents the nasalized [o] which in IPA would be transcribed as [õ].

¹⁰ To drizzle.
2.3.3 Dominican Dialect Zones

The pronunciation of final /l/ and /ɾ/ serves as a way for other Dominicans to determine their interlocutors’ geographic origin (Alba 2004: 85). Alba (2004), based on Jiménez Sabater’s (1975) findings, proposes that the Dominican Republic can be divided into four dialect zones according to the pronunciation of final liquids.

Figure 2.2 Dominican Dialect Zones. Vertical lines: r → l (puerta → puerta), Diagonal lines: r,l→ i (puerta → puejta), Horizontal lines: assimilation: (puerta → puetta), Blank space: l→ r (falda → farda) (Alba 2004: 86).

The first feature is lambdacism, /ɾ/ to [l] is characteristic of the Capital District\textsuperscript{11}: gordo > [goldo]. The second feature is rhotacism which describes the articulation of /l/ as [ɾ], also in syllable-final position, is characteristic of speakers from the South: falda >[farda]. The third

\textsuperscript{11} El Distrito Nacional includes Santo Domingo and surrounding towns.
feature is progressive assimilation and is found in the East: *gordo* > [goddo]. The fourth feature is vocalization of both final liquids, /l/ and /ɾ/. Vocalization does not enjoy social prestige and is strongly associated with rural populations from the Cibao Region, in the north of the country: *gordo* > [go̞jdo]. The vocalization of final liquids is considered a uniquely Dominican feature in that it is rarely found in other varieties of Spanish (Lipski 2011: 77). Alba (2004) recognizes that the origin of this phenomenon is still contentious with most scholars agreeing that the feature is a vestige of the speakers from the Canary Islands.

The variants described delineate dialect zones in the Dominican Republic, but the occurrences of these features are in no way absolute or uniform; within each dialectal zone there is considerable variation. Distinct regional pronunciations of final liquids are reduced in formal speech. A variant shared across all dialect zones is /ɾ/ deletion, particularly with the pronunciation of the conjunction *porque* as [poØke] and infinitives like *jugar* → [hugaØ]. In the case of *porque* given its frequency in speech, its unstressed pronunciation in a sentence, and the rate at which it is deleted, /ɾ/ deletion in this case is not stigmatized (Alba 2004: 91).

### 2.3.4 Sociolinguistic Variation of /l/ and /ɾ/ in the Dominican Republic

Alba’s 1990 study *Variación fonética y diversidad social en el español dominicano de Santiago* was one of the first sociolinguistic studies on Dominican Spanish. The study looked at the use of final /s/, /l/, and /ɾ/ among 17 men and 18 women in Santiago, the second largest city in the Dominican Republic. Santiago is also located in the Cibao region, which, as previously mentioned, is known for the vocalization of final liquids. Alba used the statistical program VARBRUL 2S to analyze 12,684 tokens for final /s/, /l/, and /ɾ/.

To analyze the data, Alba considers social and linguistic variables. For extralinguistic variables, he takes into account gender, age, education, and income, with the final two variables
being interdependent. For linguistic factors, Alba looks at the segment following the variable in question, the syllable stress, word category/word type, whether it is word-internal or word-final. Later research on Caribbean Spanish (Alfaraz 2000; Lipski 2011), confirms Alba’s results, which show that /l/ is more resistant to variation while /ɾ/ is more susceptible to sociolinguistic variation. Alba finds that the vocalization of final liquids is not as prominent as suspected. Other forms, including the standard, are more frequent in speakers from Santiago. Given the significance of this work for my own analysis, I will discuss its findings in more detail.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of /ɾ/</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocalization</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateralization</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Overall percentage of variant use of final /ɾ/ (Adapted from Alba 1990: 163)

Speakers produced many variants with the standard trill and fricative pronunciations being the most frequent with a combined total of 56%. Non-standard forms such as vocalization and deletion were also present. His findings on Spanish in Santiago show that lateralization of final /ɾ/ is almost non-existent and the vocalization of less frequent overall at 12%. He compares the pronunciation of final /ɾ/ (trill or fricative) in Santiago at 55% with those of San Juan, Puerto Rico at 59% (López Morales 1983:81), and Philadelphia at 49% (Poplack 1979).

---

12 Alba uses [ɾ] with a line above (macron) to designate a fricative.
González (1987) as cited in Alba (2004: 89) found that speakers from Santo Domingo did not prefer lateralization of final /ɾ/. Table 2.2 shows socioeconomic group was considered significant. While lateralization is a characteristic feature of the region, it was most present in the low group at 30%. However, deletion was the preferred variant among the low group 43%, and it also more present in the middle, 30%, and high groups (19%). The fact that deletion is shared across social groups more so than lateralization suggests that the former is less stigmatized while the latter carries more social significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of /ɾ/</th>
<th>Low Group</th>
<th>Middle Group</th>
<th>High Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trill/Fricative</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateralization</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 Variants of final /ɾ/ in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic (González 1987 as adapted in Alba (2004: 89)).

When it comes to final /l/, Table 2.3 indicates that the lateral pronunciation, the standard, is the most common with vocalization and deletion comprising 16% and 13% respectively of all tokens. Upon considering the factor social group, a different pattern arises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of /l/</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocalization</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 Overall occurrences of final /l/ (Alba 1990: 137)
Table 2.5 demonstrates how deletion of final /l/ is found in all groups, but rarely used in the high group. However, the vocalized variant is non-existent in the high group and very rare middle group, which suggests that the feature is strongly associated with lower social groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of /l/</th>
<th>Low Group</th>
<th>Middle Group</th>
<th>High Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lateralization</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocalization</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 Overall rates of final /l/ in Santiago based on social group (Alba 2004: 89).

Sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/ and /l/ has a social and dialectal component. Final /ɾ/ in has many variants with a high degree of social stratification in both the Santo Domingo and Cibao dialect zones. We see that final /l/, while demonstrating a degree of sociolinguistic variation, is more resistant when compared to final /ɾ/. The susceptibility to variation of final liquids is worth considering not only in the country of origin, but especially in the diaspora where dialectal and language contact can interact with new sociolinguistic variables to create an environment that might impact said degree of susceptibility.

### 2.4 Spanish in the United States

After English, Spanish is the second most spoken language in the United States (Lipski: 2008: 1). According to the most recent estimates of the 2019 American Community Survey (Census Bureau 2019), there are approximately 47.7 million individuals 5 and older in the US who speak Spanish. Spanish has a long history in the United States dating back to colonialism. The Spanish founded their first settlement in 1565 in present day Saint Augustine, Florida. Subsequent waves of colonization and settlement extended the Spanish language throughout the Spanish territories (The Viceroy of New Spain), which in the present day includes many
Southwestern states (Sayahi, Reyes, Corbett 2016: 14). In the 18th century many of those Southwestern states (Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, etc.) went from Spanish to Mexican rule thanks to the Mexican War of Independence from 1810–21. It is also worth noting that during this time there was an increased effort by Mexican politicians to have Spanish be the official language (Klee and Lynch 2009: 118). After signing the Treaty of Hidalgo in 1846, the United States acquired these territories and, consequently, Spanish speakers (Escobar and Potowski 2015: 6–7). These Spanish-speaking communities are still visible today in the traditional varieties of Colorado and New Mexico (Lipski 2008: 2).

Many of today’s Spanish-speaking communities in the United States are the descendants of those who arrived during earlier waves of immigration from Latin America with some dating back to the beginning of the 19th century. Established communities, such as Mexicans in the Southwest, can trace their origins not only to colonial times but to more recent waves of immigration in the 20th century encouraged by the Bracero program and other opportunities for work in the United States. A large portion of Puerto Ricans in the Northeast, particularly in New York, can trace their origins back to the first waves of migration following the Second World War. There were, however, Puerto Rican neighborhoods that date back to the 1920’s when many Puerto Ricans came to the mainland United States in search for employment (Lipski 2008: 119). Cubans in the Southeast can point to the Cuban Revolution in 1959 as the beginning of large-scale migration to the United States, with more waves following in the 1980s due to the Mariel

---

13 The Bracero program was initiated by the United States that recruited temporary laborers from Mexico to compensate for America’s reduced workforce during and following World War I (Lipski 2008: 79)
Boatlift\textsuperscript{14}. The 1980s are characterized by large waves of Central Americans, South Americans, and Dominicans. The establishment of these immigrant communities in the United States gave rise to what Escobar and Potowski (2015: 13) call sociolinguistic regions of Spanish in the US. This term considers the varieties of Spanish in a specific area, each with a unique history shaped by a complex combination of political developments and various waves of immigration. Escobar and Potowski (2015: 14) divide the US into 7 sociolinguistic regions; Northeast, Midatlantic, Southeast, Midwest, Central South, Northwest, and Southwest.

In order to understand the position of Spanish in the United States, we must also mention the role that English plays in determining its status across various sociolinguistic regions. While there is no official language in the United States at the federal level, English is the main language for the majority of the population. In the United States it is common for communities with speakers of languages other than English to undergo language shift by the 3\textsuperscript{rd} generation (Ortman and Stevens 2008). Whether a language is maintained or ultimately replaced by English depends on a multitude of factors, occurring both within and outside of the United States’ border (Lipski 2008: 5). There is also the question of age at which person arrives in the United States. The later one arrives, the less likely it is that they will learn English (Fuller 2013: 85–86). In addition to the age at arrival and transmission across generations, each community where a language is spoken has its own degree of ethnolinguistic vitality, which include demographic factors, status factors\textsuperscript{15}, and institutional support (Fuller 2013: 92). Besides extralinguistic factors affecting

\textsuperscript{14} The Mariel Boatlift was a large-scale wave of immigration from Cuba to the United States in 1980 that brought over 125,000 Cubans to Southern Florida, many of whom were seeking political asylum.

\textsuperscript{15} Demographic and status factors of the Dominican Community will be explored later in this chapter in section 2.7. Status factors with respect to Dominican Spanish in the US are further explored in section 4.2.
language maintenance, there is also the question of language acquisition and language input. Some linguists argue that a considerable or “critical mass” of language input is needed for children to acquire linguistic forms. Further research needs to be done to determine what that “critical mass” of input might be (Silva-Corvalán 2014: 4). Lipski (2008:5) notes that, for the time being, Spanish will retain its place as the largest second language spoken in the United States thanks, in part, to continuous waves of immigration.

2.4.1 Research on Spanish in the United States

Research on Spanish in the United States is substantial and constantly adapting to describe the changing population of speakers. Lipski (2008) provides a bibliography and discussion of research on the United States during the earlier part of the 2000s. Escobar and Potowski (2015) offer an overview of the linguistic phenomena and socio-historical background of Spanish in the United States. Studies on Spanish in the United States cross all branches of linguistics, analyzing variation and the implications of contact with English on the phonology, syntax, and lexicon of the contact varieties. In addition to psycholinguistic and traditional linguistic analyses of phenomena associated with English-Spanish contact, more recent research has looked at dialect contact among Spanish speaking groups.

The linguistic behavior of Spanish speakers in the United States can also be analyzed within its greater social context. Sociolinguistic and anthropological frameworks can be utilized to uncover the ways in which language is influenced by both the individual and the community. Another framework, an “anthro-political linguistic perspective” (Zentella 2008: 3-4), looks beyond the community and takes in account the socio-political and ideological contexts that frame language among Spanish speakers.
When studying language maintenance and contact phenomena in the United States, linguists consider sociolinguistic generation. Sociolinguistic generation takes into account the speaker’s birthplace, age at arrival, and years of residency in the United States. My research focuses on generations 1, 1.5, and 2. The literature does not always agree on the criteria for distinguishing between the generations. Escobar and Potowski (2015: 22) offer a detailed description of sociolinguistic generations using established criteria from Silva-Corvalán (1994) (G1: 12 years and older, G2: 6–11 years old) and introducing additional criteria (Potowski and Torres forthcoming, G1: arriving at 9 and up). I grouped my participant’s according to Rumbaut’s (2012) configuration, which are closer to Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) groupings.

The first category is pre-school children (ages 0-5 at arrival); these children have little to no memory of their country of origin. They do not receive any formal education in their country of origin and do most of their schooling and socialization in the host country. Their experiences are similar to those who were born in the host country. For this reason, I have grouped all these participants, both US-born and those born abroad, in Generation 2. Members of this generation is considered native English speakers; they will not have a foreign accent. Generation 1.5 (ages 6–12) receives some formal education in their country of origin but complete their elementary education in the host country. These individuals are known to have high levels of bilingualism (Escobar and Potowski 2015: 22; Rumbaut 2012: 1). Generation 1 refers to those who were born in the country of origin and came to the host country after the age of 12. Even though some speakers will come as adolescents, their experiences in the host country are similar to those who came as young adults. The likelihood of having similar experiences with young adult immigrants can be attributed to factors such as coming to the host country alone, or to entering
the workforce shortly after arrival. Additionally, depending on how early in adolescence immigrants arrive, they may or may not continue secondary education (Rumbaut 2012: 2).

2.4.2 Linguistic Features of Spanish in the United States

The following sections provide a general linguistic description of Spanish spoken in the United States across the different sociolinguistic regions according to the type of speaker.

2.4.2.1 Phonology

Studies on Spanish in the US have sought to uncover the ways in which the phonetics and phonology of bilingual individuals differ from those of monolingual Spanish speakers and second language learners. One method of investigating these differences comes through analyzing voice onset time (VOT)\(^{16}\). Bullock and Toribio (2009b) looked at the VOT of stops in Spanish of bilingual speakers to ascertain the similarities and differences in pronunciations of native Spanish speakers, bilingual speakers, and second language learners. While there are differences between all groups, bilingual speakers produced a VOT like those of native speakers, which suggests that bilingual speakers acquire a native like system of pronunciation.

Escobar and Potowski (2015: 141) describe additional aspects of Spanish in the US that include the pronunciation of the grapheme “v” as [v] where Spanish phonology does not distinguish between the graphemes “b” and “v” such as in *vida* [viða] instead of [biða]. The phoneme /ɾ/ can also be pronounced as a retroflex [ɾ] as in English: *mar* [maɾ]. Other particularities of US Spanish are the presence of [æ] for /o/ in Cuban American Spanish *octubre* [æ]ctubre and [ʃ] for /ʃ/ in a variety of dialects in the US, the latter being a phenomenon found in monolingual communities in the Spanish-speaking world as well. Another point of difference

---

\(^{16}\) Voice onset time (VOT) refers to the interval of time between the end of the production of a stop consonant and the beginning (onset) of voicing, the vibration of the vocal cords (Escobar and Potowski 2015: 105).
in the contact varieties of Spanish, particularly of Generation 2 and onwards, is the difference in suprasegmental features. Spanish speakers in generations 2 and 3 are more likely to possess suprasegmental characteristics such as prosody closer to English than Spanish (Escobar and Potowski 2015: 140).

2.4.2.2 Morphosyntax

Simplification in a contact situation refers to the reduction or absence of grammatical expressions or morphology that would normally be present in the Spanish of the first generation. A common example of simplification is the loss of subjunctive mood morphology in constructions that require it (e.g., _El quería que yo lo hiciera_) beginning in the second generation and increasing in the third generation (Silva-Corvalán 1994). The indicative is replacing the subjunctive in these generations, even in obligatory contexts. Additional examples of simplification can be found in the omission of the conjunction _que_ preceding the subordinate clauses which can traced back to English where “that” is not obligatory in all instances (Escobar and Potowski 2015: 142). These authors also mention features that, while present in Spanish spoken outside of the United States, become more prominent in US Spanish such as the use of overt subject pronouns “Yo le hice la traducción pero yo no sabía para quién era” (143). I will discuss overt subject pronouns in more detail in section 2.6.

2.4.2.3 Lexicon

Loanwords are borrowed from one language into another with “[t]otal morphemic incorporation of single or compound words” and “[v]arying degrees of phonemic substitution” (Winford 2003: 45). The phonological adaptation of loanwords into Spanish serves to differentiate this phenomenon from intrasentential code-switching in which each language maintains its own phonological and morphosyntactic rules. Poplack (2011: 647-648) argues that
two additional criteria for determining whether a word is a loanword or an instance of code-switching, particularly within the context of US Spanish, is the degree of diffusion and frequency in a given linguistic community.

Other terms can get borrowed from English even if the word exists in Spanish. Cultural borrowing refers to the incorporation of a term that culturally represents a different concept. Otheguy and García (1993) provide the example, *comedor* “lunchroom” which does not evoke the same image of a school dining hall characteristic of American elementary and high schools. “Lunchroom” is used to express the appropriate cultural meaning (143).

Semantic extension (loanshift) describes words that look similar in both languages but semantically have different meanings; the word has acquired a new meaning that is different from the one used in the country of origin. The verb *aplicar* “to apply” shares many meanings with English. It doesn’t however share the meaning of “applying to a job” or to “apply for a position”. In Latin America and Spain, the term *solicitar* is preferred. The term *aplicar* in US Spanish has acquired an additional meaning, “to apply for something” such as a job.

Instances of borrowing can also be seen in calques: word-for-word translations. Some have been accepted such as *rascacielo* “skyscraper” and others like *tener un buen tiempo* “to have a good time” reveal the influence of English when native Spanish speakers outside the US would say *pasarla/pasarlo bien*.

Also present in US Spanish are English discourse markers such as “so” and “y’know” Bilingual speakers possessing varying levels of proficiency in both English and Spanish frequently insert discourse markers (Lipski 2005; Torres 2002). The more dominant a speaker is in English, the more likely it is that English discourse markers will appear in their Spanish (Escobar and Potowski 2015: 138). While more present in the speech of the second and third
generations, discourse markers can also be found, albeit less frequently in the speech of first
generations speakers.

2.4.2.4 Code-switching

Code-switching refers to “those cases where bilingual speakers alternate between codes
within the same speech event, switch codes within a single term, or mix elements from two codes
within the same utterance” (Winford 2003: 103). Initial studies on code-switching among
bilingual speakers of Spanish focused on 3 types of code-switches: 1) intersentential: a code-
switch between two sentences, 2) intrasentential: a code-switch that occurs in the same sentences
and 3) discourse markers/tags such as “so” and “you know” (Poplack 1980). Code-switching
must follow these generalized constraints in which “(1) no grammatical rule in either language
[can] be violated and (2) the point of transition be smooth” (Lipski 2008: 231). Motivations for
code-switching include a variety of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors such as
accommodation and divergence, which I will discuss in more detail in section 2.5.

“Spanglish” is a contentious term that can refer to any or all of the contact phenomena
discussed in the previous subsections under 2.4.3. Colloquially Spanglish “refer[s] to popular
forms of the language [Spanish] of many Hispanics in the United States (Otheguy and Stern
2011: 87). While linguists recognize the possibility of English influence in US varieties of
Spanish, Otheguy and Stern (2011) reject the term due to the fact “it expresses an ideology of
exceptionalism and scorn that actually deprives the North American Latin community of a major
resource in this globalized world” (85). In lieu of the term “Spanglish” the authors suggest that
varieties of Spanish in the United States be treated like any other of Spanish in the world, unique
and valid in its own right.
2.5 Spanish Dialect Contact in the US

There is a substantial body of literature on English speaking countries that explores various aspects of dialect contact such as linguistic accommodation, leveling, the creation of hybrid dialect, and new speech varieties (Kerswill 2002; Trudgill 1986; Kerswill and Williams 2005). These studies mainly describe two types of dialect contact. The first is where speakers of dialect A move to an area where dialect B is dominant. The assumption is that one dialect is more prominent demographically and socially. Additionally, the influence normally moves in one direction with dialect A being influenced by dialect B. The second type is where there is no dominant dialect and speakers of many varieties converge in one area. The third type is where dialects of a minority language come into contact in an area dominated by the majority language, such as the case with dialects of Spanish coming into contact with English.

Linguistic accommodation is where speakers converge to one another, eliminating or reducing certain distinguishing features during speech. Conversely, divergence refers to speakers marking differences in their speech to distinguish themselves more from their interlocutors. Both accommodation (convergence) and divergence can occur at the phonetic, lexical, and syntactic level.

Aarón and Hernández (2007) look at the contact-induced phonetic accommodation of Salvadorans to Mexicans in Houston, Texas by analyzing the rate of final /s/ production. Mexican Spanish is more likely to maintain final /s/ as [s] while Salvadoran Spanish shows more variation between maintenance and aspiration [h]. The researchers find that Salvadorans produce more final /s/ as [s] instead of [h]. Phonetic accommodation in this circumstance can be

---

17 See Pesqueria 2008 and Rodríguez Cadena 2006 for dialect contact of Cubans and Argentines in Mexico City.
attributed to the stigmatization final /s/ aspiration carries in the multidialectal community and the demographically and culturally predominant Mexican population. The frequency of [s] production correlates with the speakers’ age at the time of arrival to Houston. The earlier a speaker arrived in Houston, the more probable [s] production will be. For those who arrived in Houston between the ages of 0–7 and 8–14, there is a near categorical loss of [h] with a combined frequency of 3% for both groups. Speakers who arrived between the ages of 15–25, and 26 and older produced aspiration at higher rates, 13% and 43% respectively. Aarón and Hernández (2007) point to different social reasons for linguistic accommodation such as changing their speech on their journey through Mexico to the United States, and once in the States, trying to blend in with the already present Mexican community. It is important to note that phonetic accommodation in this case concerns a variant of /s/ that is already present in the Salvadoran dialect. The use of [s] points to a change in frequency, not the acquisition or incorporation of a new feature into the original dialect.

In addition to dialect contact and subsequent phonetic accommodation amongst different Spanish-speaking groups, Potowski (2008) considers the effects of dialect contact in families where the parents speak two different varieties of Spanish. Her study analyzes the speech of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and MexiRicans (Mexican and Puerto Rican) across three generations in Chicago looking at final /s/ and initial /t/ production. Mexicans did not present any accommodation based on their generation nor their interlocutor. Puerto Ricans did not change their pronunciation of final /s/ which suggests accommodation is not taking place with this specific variable and/or that the feature is not stigmatized. One area of accommodation is suggested with the pronunciation of velar /r/ being reserved for in-group interactions. For MexiRican speakers, Potowski (2008) finds that in general, their speech patterns closely match
those of Mexican speakers, which she suggests could be attributed to Mexican Spanish’s status in Chicago. She found that MexiRican speakers are more likely to use the Spanish dialects of their mothers citing the example that speakers with Puerto Rican mothers statistically reduced final /s/ more and produced more instances of velarized /r/.

Zentella (1990) studied the use of lexical items among Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Cubans, and Colombians. The study focused on the familiarity of speakers with the lexical items of various dialects. While most of the speakers are Caribbean except for Colombia, not all dialects enjoyed the same amount of prestige at the time. While Puerto Rican and Dominicans speakers were more familiar with Colombian and Cuban lexicon, the same was not true the other way around. At the time, Cubans and Colombians enjoyed more prestige and, thus, so did their varieties of Spanish.

2.6 Spanish in the Northeast

The visibility and status of Dominican Spanish in the United States has changed along with the shifting demographics of the Northeast. Studies on Dominicans in the United States show that despite dialect contact with other varieties of Spanish, Dominican lexicon is maintained (Zentella 1990). Sustained dialect contact has prompted linguists to question whether a unique speech community has emerged in New York. Otheguy and Zentella (2012) look at variation in the production of overt personal pronouns among bilingual Spanish-speakers in New York City. The speakers were divided into two main groups: Mainlanders (Colombians, Ecuadorians, Mexicans) and Caribbeans (Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic). The authors sought to uncover the ways in which the presence or absence of overt personal

---

18 Otheguy and Zentella 2012 use the term “dialectal” instead of dialect “to avoid the implication that there are Mainland dialects supported by uniquely shared clustering of features” (10).
pronouns in their speech has theoretical implications for language contact and dialectal contact. Overt personal pronouns were chosen because of the variation in their use with Caribbean speakers producing personal pronouns more frequently than Mainlanders. Additionally, personal pronouns were used because of the similarities English and Spanish share: similar deictic meanings, similar singular/plural paradigms, and the fact that personal pronouns can appear before or after the subject (Otheguy and Zentella 2012: 17). The social factors taken into account are gender, age at arrival, region of origin, birthplace, and years residing in the United States.

In general, significant cross-linguistic influence can be seen in New York Spanish. The authors found that the use of overt pronouns was present at a higher rate in the speech of those who 1) were born in the United States or came to the US before the age of three, 2) arrived in the US at an early age, and 3) have spent many years in the United States. Higher use of overt personal pronouns can be attributed to higher levels of bilingualism and more exposure to English. Otheguy and Zentella explain, however, that “despite differences in generation, gender, age, class, proficiency [their participants] deploy pronouns in significant ways that reaffirm their membership in the same Spanish-speaking community in NYC” (2012: 177). The authors also note that while English influence does play a role in the Spanish of New York bilinguals, overall they “remain closely affiliated with the grammars of reference lects” (Otheguy and Zentella 2012: 201).

With respect to the constraints of variables for personal pronouns across generations 1 and 2 in the US, Otheguy and Zentella found that participants share the same underlying constraints except for the variable “person”. Differences also arise in terms of New York raised and newcomers’ sensitivity to and application of constraints (2012: 176). It is important to consider the ways in which speakers of different generations, in what some might call the same
speech community, speak similarly enough to signal membership, but also differ in ways that only quantitative research might uncover.

Interdialectal influence is also present in New York, but this trend is not absolute across all groups. With Caribbean Spanish being the default in the region, Mainlanders’ overt personal pronoun production is skewed in the direction of Caribbean Spanish. The production of overt personal pronouns is also determined by which group of Spanish speakers a person interacts with most: in-group vs. out-group orientation. Those who interacted mostly with speakers from the same region of origin (Mainlander vs. Caribbean) will show similarities in the occurrence of personal pronouns. The authors conclude that leveling, in conjunction with intergenerational contact in New York have created a unique speech community that differs from but still maintains connections with dialects of the Latin American homelands. The variation found in the production of personal pronouns by New York-raised speakers supports the authors’ claim that “bilingual lects are not always as simplified or reduced and that they should not always be characterized as weakening or losing pragmatic constraints” (Otheguy and Zentella 2012: 217).

2.7 Dominicans in the United States

The Pew Research Center states that as of 2013 there are an estimated 1.8 million Hispanics of Dominican Origin in the United States, with over half being foreign-born (López 2015). While Puerto Ricans have historically been the largest Latino group in New York City, as of 2013 Dominicans (747,473) now outnumber Puerto Ricans (719,444) (Bergad 2014). Dominicans are not limited to New York City with significant populations of Dominicans in Bergen-Passaic Counties, New Jersey; Providence, Rhode Island; Lawrence, Massachusetts; and Miami, Florida (Bullock and Toribio 2014; López 2015).
Large numbers of Dominicans did not arrive to the United States until after the Trujillo Dictatorship (1930–1961). During this period, formal travel abroad was limited. Following the assassination of Trujillo and the end of his dictatorship in 1961, Dominicans were slowly allowed to apply for visas and, ultimately, leave the country. With the end of the Trujillo Era and new opportunities for employment in the US, Dominican immigration to the United has been on the rise (Lipski 2008: 134). Over time, Dominicans established enclave communities in New York City, with significant populations in the Bronx and Manhattan (Bullock and Toribio 2014: 153).

2.7.1 Linguistic Studies on Dominicans in the United States

Dominicans were not the first Spanish-speaking community in New York. They encountered a community of Spanish-speaking groups from Latin America dating to the late 19th century (Otheguy and Zentella 2012). Most importantly, Dominicans encountered established communities of Puerto Ricans, a group that also speaks a Caribbean variety of Spanish. An increasing number of studies on Dominican Spanish in the United States focus on the linguistic and social consequences of language maintenance, bilingualism, dialect contact, and Dominican identity (Corbett, Reyes, and Sayahi 2020).

The general characteristics of Dominican Spanish in the United States reflect features found in the reference lect\textsuperscript{19}. In the speech of Dominicans two areas are the most represented: the Cibao province of Santiago with 20% originating from this area and the Santo Domingo Region at 30% (Lipski 2008: 135\textsuperscript{20}). This representation of dialects skews Dominican Spanish to rural

\textsuperscript{19} See sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4.
\textsuperscript{20} Lipski cites Grasmuck and Pessar 1991’s study \textit{Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration}. Despite the age of the study and probability that the makeup of immigration had changed over the past 30 years, those earlier waves of immigration still helped shape the sociolinguistic environment of New York Dominican Spanish.
varieties as speakers bring the varieties they acquired in the Dominican Republic to the United States. Lipski (2008: 138) notes that Dominican Spanish finds itself in an “unconstrained sociolinguistic environment”. Lack of constraints here can be understood as relaxed or reduced ideological pressures to produce normative (prescriptive) speech. This type of environment would allow for speech forms that are normally discouraged on the mainland to flourish in this new sociolinguistic environment.

Dominicans in the US have access to multiple sociolinguistic environments due in part to the community’s transnationalism. According to the Pew Research Center, Dominicans are more recent immigrants with 64% of immigrants arriving after 1990 (Brown and Patten 2013). Additionally, ease of travel coupled with advances in technology have helped maintain social ties despite geographic boundaries. This in turn allows for sustained linguistic contact between communities in the US and the Dominican Republic, thus creating expanded sociolinguistic environments (Dicker 2006).

The social and linguistic effects of bilingualism have been studied in the Dominican communities (Bailey 2002; Toribio 2000a, 2000b). Dominicans in the United States show high levels of language maintenance and, in turn, language loyalty (Lipski 2008; Bullock and Toribio 2014). Spanish serves many social functions for Dominicans in the US. It provides a means to build and maintain a community and resist forces of racialization in the United States. Upon entering the United States, Dominicans become exposed to racial dynamics not present in the Dominican Republic. In the Dominican Republic there is a rejection of being Black, which is associated with Haiti (Toribio 2000b). While these feelings are not shared publicly, they persist in Dominican society as vestiges of the Trujillo era ideology of “hispanidad”, which defined Dominicans as “the most pure Spanish people in the Americas” (263).
In the United States Dominicans must confront not only mainland Dominican ideologies on race, but also the dominant discourse on race in the United States. Bailey (2002) studied the linguistic behavior of Dominican-American adolescents\(^2\) in Rhode Island to better understand their identity as they (re)negotiate their ethnic and racial categories (1). Bailey describes a disparity between how Dominicans see themselves as opposed to how they are seen by others who use phenotype based racial categories as the main criterion for social organization in the United States (258). Dominicans define themselves not by phenotype, but rather by the use of Spanish. By speaking Spanish these teenagers in Rhode Island assert their Dominican identity. They create solidarity with one another and maintain an ethnolinguistic identity that is not based on race but rather on the use of Spanish.

2.8 Sociolinguistic Variation of final /ɾ/ in Caribbean Dialects in the United States

There is little research on the sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/ among Dominicans in the United States. Sociolinguistic research on the variation of final /ɾ/ in Caribbean dialects in the United States has traditionally focused on speakers of Cuban and Puerto Ricans speakers of Spanish. Research on Cuban and Puerto Rican Spanish in the United States offers insight into the possible relationships that might arise in Dominicans communities in the US between variation of final /ɾ/ pronunciation and social factors.

Lamboy’s (2004) *Caribbean Spanish in the Metropolis* looks at the neutralization of final /ɾ/ and /s/ among Cuban, Dominican, and Puerto Rican speakers in the New York City Area. Lamboy uses the term neutralization in this context to mean non-standard pronunciations of final /ɾ/ and /s/. Additionally, two of the main factors he looked at was generation in the United States.

\(^2\) These adolescents include those in the United States and those who came to the United States from the Dominican Republic before the age of 8.
and age. His criterion for determining generation in the US was birthplace. With the exception of Cuban speakers, Lamboy (2004) found different levels of neutralization based on what generation speakers belonged to. Cuban speakers produced standard variants of final /ɾ/ at very similar rates: Generation 1 at 27% and generation 2 at 28% (Lamboy 2004: 80). The difference then in maintenance or neutralization is just 1%.

Speakers of Dominican and Puerto Rican Spanish present different trends. Dominicans from generation one produced standard variants of final /ɾ/ 33% of the time compared to 20% of generation 2 (Lamboy 2004: 81). There is a 13% percent difference in retention among the two generations. For Puerto Ricans, generation 1 final /ɾ/ is maintained at 31% compared to the second-generation at 19% (Lamboy 2004: 84), a 12% difference between the generations. In addition to /ɾ/ and final /s/, Lamboy looked at other features specific to each dialect, like the velarization of /r/ in Puerto Rican Spanish and the neutralization of final /l/ in Dominican Spanish. Dominican participants in his study maintained final /l/ at high rates: generation 1 at 92% and generation 2 at 89% (Lamboy 2004: 83). Other variants, like vocalization and rhotacism were rare.

Research has also shed light on the role age groups play in final liquid variation. Alfaraz (2007) in “Effects of Age and Gender on Liquid Assimilation in Cuban Spanish” looks at final liquid variation among two age groups of speakers born and raised Central Cuba. Her data show that the younger age group showed higher rates of assimilation than the older group:

/ɾ/ → 29% vs. 8%, /l/ → 34% vs. 7%. According to Alfaraz (2007), the data “suggest that assimilation has advanced significantly from one generation to the next for both liquids” (25). It is important to note though that in terms of gender, the differences were more significant for /ɾ/.

22 Group 1: 27–37 years old, group 2: 62–69 years old.
than final /ɾ/: 37% vs. 22% and 36% vs. 26% respectively (26). Alfaraz suggests that men have led the change to more liquid assimilation in Cuban Spanish. Due to men’s mobility in Cuba, there were more opportunities for contact with the Havana dialect. She explains:

Liquid assimilation, as a nonstandard feature that defined the speech of the most important urban area in Cuba, would have been invested with covert prestige, and it would have appealed to men from provincial towns who wished to align themselves with, and project to others, the positive qualities associated with Havana, and highlight the social privileges granted to men (Alfaraz 2007: 29).

In addition to intergenerational (age group) differences, a speaker’s mobility within the country of origin, along with desires to align themselves with varieties that carry covert prestige, further complicate the idea of a single reference lect in sociolinguistic research. Consideration of multiple reference lects with an eye on gender and age groups will be important in future studies.

The aforementioned phenomena have also been explored in Puerto Rican Spanish in the United States. While older research on Puerto Rican Spanish focused more on the Northeast, more recent research has documented Spanish use in different Puerto Rican communities in the Midwest (Lamboy 2004; Ramos-Pellicia 2007, 2020; Valentín-Marquez 2015). Valentín-Márquez (2015) compared the pronunciation of final /ɾ/ between two Puerto Rican communities: one in Cabo Rojo, Puerto Rico and another in Grand Rapids, Michigan. While he did not look at the generation (1,2,3) of participants in Grand Rapids, his research did show differences in the realization of final /ɾ/ between both communities. Puerto Ricans from Cabo Rojo produced the lateral more at 42.3% compared to 27.38% from the Grand Rapids community. In terms of the /ɾ/ pronunciation, the Cabo Rojo group produced the variant 19.1% while the Grand Rapids maintained the standard variant at 32%.
Two of Valentín-Márquez’s findings are of particular relevance to this dissertation. The first is that different environments (linguistic factors) “constrained the production of variants of /ɾ/ in two different communities” (2020: 355). Valentín-Márquez questions the degree to which contact with English might influence variation. The second finding is the degree to which community integration in Grand Rapids influenced final /ɾ/ production. Those members who were more integrated into the community lateralized final /ɾ/ at a rate of 51%. Those who were rated as having lower levels of integration showed a preference for maintenance of /ɾ/ at 45% (Valentin-Márquez 2015: 336). A speaker from Grand Rapids can use the lateralized variant as a marker of Puerto Rican Spanish. Signaling Puerto Rican identity through lateralization is less marked socially than producing the stigmatized velarized /ɾ/ typically associated with Puerto Rican Spanish. While both communities originate in Puerto Rico, we can see that the sociolinguistic environments they inhabit are quite different, producing different rates of variation, along with different social pressures to produce one variant over another.

Ramos-Pellicia (2020) explores the dynamics of community and sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/ in Puerto Rican Spanish. In her most recent study, she looks at two communities within the US, one in the township of Hazlet, NJ outside of New York City and the other in Lorain, Ohio outside of Columbus, Ohio. Ramos-Pellicia (2020) explores generational differences in both communities: generation 1 are those born in Puerto Rico and arrived in the US at the age of 12 or older, generation 2 are those of Puerto Rican heritage who were born in the US but whose parents are generation 1, generation 3 are those born in the US to Puerto Ricans who were also born in the US. In addition to generational differences, Ramos-Pellicia (2020) looks at community size and argues that “if a minority linguistic community is larger
because of the possibility of having more contacts with speakers of the same minority language in the region, there will be a greater tendency to hold the patterns of the ancestral variety” (36).

While both communities are maintaining a variety of Spanish that originated in Puerto Rico, they show different trends in terms of their final /ɾ/ production. The Hazlet community prefers the lateralized variant overall at 87% with lateralization occurring most in word-final position at 97.4% (Ramos-Pellicia 2020: 4–47). In terms of type of word, lateralization occurred the most with infinitives (97.1%) and conjugated verbs (92.3%). Ramos-Pellicia’s (2020) data on the Lorain community also shows an overall preference for lateralization. However, when also considering factors like generation in the US, she found that /ɾ/ usage declines across the generations. Speakers in generation 1 use more [ɾ], generation 2 is almost evenly split between [ɾ] and [l] and generation 3 prefers the lateralized variant (49). Gender differences among speakers from Lorain show women slightly prefer the standard variant over the lateral and men demonstrate a slight preference for the lateralized variant over the tap (49).

In this section I discussed research on final /ɾ/ in Caribbean Spanish in the United States. While there are similarities between the reference lect and the contact lect, differences emerge between generations, genders, and communities. Referring to Puerto Rican Spanish, Ramos-Pellicia (2020) argues that “[c]ontrary to what could be thought about this variety of Spanish in the United States, there is not a clear trend of how speakers use their language variety” (50). When looking at a variety of Spanish in the United States, one must take into consideration the specific community a speaker belongs to, the degree of contact they have with not only the reference lect, but also with other dialects of Spanish and English.
2.9 Language Attitudes

Linguistic insecurity among Dominicans stems from attitudes and ideologies present in the Dominican Republic. These attitudes and ideologies are shaped by the interplay of a variety of factors including historical, cultural, and racial dynamics. Alba (2004: 314–315) attributes Dominican linguistic insecurity to their socio-economic status both locally and globally, in addition to a tumultuous political history. He argues that the combination of these factors has caused Dominicans to place more value on foreign products and ideals. Alba (2004) suggests Dominicans suffer from linguistic insecurity because they put more value on foreign varieties of Spanish over their own dialect. He notes, however, that despite a high level of linguistic insecurity, Dominicans do not categorically avoid stigmatized forms. This can be attributed to the language loyalty and the covert prestige that comes from using more local and, therefore, more Dominican forms (216). When Dominicans arrive in the United States, the ideologically “unconstrained sociolinguistic environment” of Dominican Spanish further reduces the pressure to conform to prescriptive norms and encourages Dominicans to speak varieties of Spanish that hold more value and (covert) prestige in the community (Lipski 2008: 138).

A survey demonstrated that Dominicans are acutely aware of the stigmatization of vocalization of final liquids, a feature strongly associated with rural dialects of the Cibao Region (Alba 2004). It compares two main dialects of Dominican Spanish: Santiago vs. Santo Domingo. The survey was conducted among 138 university students from Santo Domingo and Santiago. The goal of the study was to better understand attitudes towards dialect features of Spanish. Students were asked to express whether they agreed with the following statement “si yo tuviera que elegir entre calta y caita, como formas de la pronunciar la palabra carta, preferiría la
Alba notes that in Santo Domingo while the change from /ɾ/ > [l] is found, it is not the default form, nor is it found exclusively in the lowest class which suggests a lack of stigmatization. 87% of the Santo Domingo respondents agreed with the statement and 78% of the Santiago respondents agreed. Alba attributes these responses to the overall stigmatization in the Dominican Republic of liquid vocalization. Lateralization, a feature normally associated with the capital, is not stigmatized which is a result of Santo Domingo’s socio-cultural and political influence in the rest of the country.

The use of Dominican Spanish by speakers in the United States has a unifying effect. Speaking in Dominican Spanish, stigmatized or not, provides Dominicans with the ability to connect with one another, creating solidarity, and fostering a positive identity of “dominicanidad” (Toribio 2000b: 261). Alba (2004: 316) quotes José Martí to exemplify the use of Dominican Spanish in the face of social or ideological pressures: “Nuestro vino es agrio, pero es nuestro vino” (Our wine is bitter but it’s our wine). The positive assertion of Dominican identity does not erase negative attitudes Dominicans may have towards their dialect, but it does help reinforce ties to culture.

2.10 Conclusion

In this chapter I situated Dominican Spanish within its larger linguistic context, paying attention to and highlighting its behavior and historical background in the Dominican Republic and the United States. Studies on Dominican Spanish in the Dominican mainland reveal a great deal of sociolinguistic variation that while sharing commonalities with other Caribbean dialects, are uniquely Dominican. Studies on Dominican Spanish in the United States are broad in their

---

23 “If I had to choose between calta and caita, as ways to pronounce the word carta (letter), I would prefer the former because calta does not sound as bad as caita.”
24 “Our wine is bitter but it’s our wine.”
approach. In the face of increased dialect contact and language contact, Dominican speakers of Spanish exhibit high levels of bilingualism and ethnolinguistic vitality. In this chapter, I also discussed how there are few studies on the sociolinguistic variation of final liquids in Dominican Spanish in the United States. Research on the sociolinguistic variation of final liquids has mostly focused on other Caribbean dialects, like Cuban Spanish in Florida and Puerto Rican Spanish in the Northeast and the Midwest. Variation within and between those Caribbean communities demonstrate why it is necessary to study a variety in its own sociolinguistic context.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

3.1 Introduction

The chapter outlines the research objectives and research questions that motivated this study. Section 3.2 describes the participants and process of data collection. Section 3.3 discusses the linguistic and social variables considered in analyzing the data.

3.1.1 Research Objectives

The goal of the present study is to describe and understand the sociolinguistic variation of final /l/ and /ɾ/ in New York Dominican Spanish based on recorded audio data. The dissertation analyzes /l/ and /ɾ/ in their phonetic contexts. Additionally, the study considers how the sociolinguistic context of a multilingual and multidialectal metropolis like New York City might affect and/or condition the realization of final /l/ and /ɾ/ in Dominican Spanish. Finally, the study seeks to uncover the outcomes of language and dialect contact on language use and attitudes among Dominicans. In this way, this dissertation attempts to address gaps in the research on Dominican Spanish across multiple generations, both in terms of age and years in the US. The dissertation also continues research on Caribbean Spanish in the US, but with a focus on the Dominican community. The study begins to address the unique contact situation in which Dominicans find themselves: interaction across multiple age groups and immigrant generations in the US, contact between different varieties of Dominican Spanish\(25\), dialectal contact between other non-Dominican varieties of Spanish, and contact with English.

---

\(25\) The dissertation did not consider southern and western dialects of Dominican Spanish. Further research would need to consider all Dominican dialect zones and their representation in New York City.
3.1.2 Research Questions

The dissertation is guided by the following research questions, which can be divided into 2 categories:

A: Language attitude

1) What are Dominicans’ attitudes towards their variety of Spanish? What are their attitudes towards other dialects of Spanish? Does that affect how they feel about the maintenance of (Dominican) Spanish in the United States?

B: Sociolinguistic Variation

1) What linguistic variables affect the production of final liquids in Dominican Spanish: position within word (environment), following feature, type of word, and stress.

2) What social variables affect the production of final liquids in Dominican Spanish: gender, birthplace, age at arrival (sociolinguistic generation), years in the United States, region of origin in the Dominican Republic.

3.2. Participants and Data Collection

3.2.1 Participants

Twenty-seven Spanish-English bilinguals, with varying degrees of proficiency\(^{26}\), from New York City participated in this research and 26 of which, 9 males and 17 females\(^{27}\), provided data for analysis. One interview was discarded given the lack of sufficient tokens for coding and extraction. Female participants are almost double the number of male participants. While all of

\(^{26}\) Participants evaluated their own level of proficiency in both English and Spanish. The categories were: excellent, very good, acceptable/passable, and poor. Most participants evaluated their Spanish as excellent or very good with only three choosing the “acceptable” category.

\(^{27}\) There is an uneven representation of participants regarding the variable gender. While I was able to elicit data from female participants, it proved to be difficult to find male participants who would be willing to participate in the study. To get a better representation of gender in New York Dominican Spanish, more males should be included in future studies.
the participants are from the New York Metropolitan Area, at the time of data collection some participants were studying and living at the University at Albany (SUNY Albany). Three participants are not from New York City proper. Two participants represent Yonkers NY, a city in Westchester County just north of the Bronx, and one is from Nassau County, Long Island. One participant was not born in either New York City or the Dominican Republic, but in Puerto Rico to Dominican parents. Since she arrived in the United at the age of 5, I grouped her with generation 2. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of participants by age at arrival and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Arrival</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–5 years (G2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12 years (G1.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or older (G1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Distribution of foreign-born participants by age of arrival and gender

Table 3.2 presents information on the participants’ ages at the time of the interview. Participants’ ages range from 18–62 years old. Participants were divided into three age groups: 18–25, 26–40, and 41 and older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at time of the interview</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Age at the time of the interview

Table 3.3 shows the distribution of participants in terms of their region of origin in the Dominican Republic.

---

28 See section 3.3.1 for explanation of the terminology.
Table 3.3 Distribution of all participants by region of origin in the Dominican Republic and gender

Table 3.4 provides information on foreign-born individuals and their years of residence in the United States. 2 male and 2 female participants moved back and forth frequently between the United States and the Dominican Republic, particularly during early childhood. I did not include the years in those transition periods, only the years in which they considered themselves permanently residing in the United States. The chart below shows the distribution of the 19 foreign-born participants. The remaining 7 participants were born and raised in the United States.

Table 3.4 Distribution of foreign-born participants by years in the US and gender

Participants were each assigned a label, which I used for subsequent identification and transcription. The labels are based on the information they provided in the questionnaire.

---

29 Four participants were born in the United States but left during early childhood. They completed some primary school in the Dominican and returned to the States to complete junior high school and high school, differentiating them from generation 2 who were born and raised in the US.
Table 3.5 Key for coding participants’ demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Information</th>
<th>Value Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M=Man W=Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #</td>
<td>Numerical Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>NY=New York, DR=Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at arrival</td>
<td>Numerical Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Origin</td>
<td>SD=Santo Domingo, C=Cibao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td>Numerical Value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, participant M1DR16C9 is male, was born in the Dominican Republic, came to the US when he was 16 and has been residing in the US for 9 years. The use of this system kept the participants’ information confidential, while also providing detailed information about sociolinguistic factors.

3.2.2 Data Collection

Data collection took place from February 2013 until June 2014. Participants were recruited via the social network approach called the “the friend of friend” technique (Tagliamonte 2006). Since I am not a member of the New York Dominican community, I had to rely on friends and acquaintances to act as intermediaries in order to gain access to participants. Many participants were students studying at the University at Albany in addition to acquaintances I had in New York City. Some participants did know each other either through Spanish classes and/or through SUNY Albany’s Equal Opportunity Program (EOP).

3.2.3 Data elicitation and handling

I met with the principal investigator for approximately 70 minutes. Informants were first presented with the consent form30. After signing the consent form, the researcher conducted

---

30 The consent form and the questionnaire presented to the participants were written in Spanish. Participants were informed that, should they wish, they could receive the forms in English.
semi-directed informal interviews. At the conclusion of the sociolinguistic interviews, the participants were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding their demographic information and language use. They were encouraged to respond in whichever language they felt most comfortable, English or Spanish. Approximately 25 hours of data were recorded and transcribed for analysis. To record the interview, I used a Sony IC Recorder ICD-PX 312 with a Sony ECMC53 clip style omnidirectional lapel microphone. I completed a broad transcription and a subsequent transcription in which I coded all the tokens of final /l/ and /ɾ/. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to analyze all tokens of final /l/ and /ɾ/.

3.2.3.1 The Sociolinguistic Interview

Informants participated in a semi-formal interview during which they spoke with the researcher for an average time of 60 minutes. Most of the interviews took place in various facilities in the Languages, Literatures and Cultures Department at the University at Albany. It is important to note that despite the informal nature of the interviews, they were still conducted in what many would consider a formal university setting. Interviews were also held at the homes of participants and at public libraries in New York City. The topics of the conversations focused on cultural and lifestyle differences between the United States and Dominican Republic. Many participants also shared their immigration stories and, for those born in the United States, memories from their trips to the Dominican Republic. All the interviews were conducted in Spanish.

3.2.3.2 The Questionnaire

Following the interview, the participants were presented with a questionnaire31 that I adapted from Otheguy and Zentella (2012). I supplemented the questionnaire with additional

31 See Appendix One.
questions on language attitudes. The questionnaire gathered information on the participants’ background and language use in order to determine the effects of non-linguistic factors on the variation of final /l/ and /ɾ/. The questionnaire is organized as follows: demographic information, education and employment, use/level of English and Spanish, Spanish use in the community, and attitudes towards different varieties of Spanish. The information was also quantified and entered into SPSS. The main factors considered when analyzing language attitudes in the Dominican community were a) Language attitudes towards Dominican Spanish, b) “Best Spanish” and “Worst” Spanish.

3.3. Extralinguistic and Linguistic Variables

3.3.1 Extralinguistic Factors

The data for these extralinguistic factors was gathered from the demographic information that participants provided in the questionnaires. Below I introduce each variable separately:

**Gender:** There are 9 male and 17 female participants.

**Birthplace:** Participants were born in either Dominican Republic, New York, or another US city.

**Age at arrival/sociolinguistic generation:** Participants provided information on their birthplace and, for those who are foreign-born, they provided their age at arrival to the United States. Based on that information, the participants were divided into 3 generations using Rumbaut’s (2012) configuration. Generation 1 designates those who arrived in the United States at or after the age of 13. Generation 1.5 includes participants who arrived in the United States from the ages of 6–12. Generation 1.5 includes some individuals who were born in the United States but who

---

32 See Section 4.2  
33 See Section 2.4.1
completed primary school in the Dominican Republic. Generation 2 includes those who were born in the United States or who came to the United States between the ages of 0–5 years.

Region of origin: Two groups, Santo Domingo (National District) and Cibao Region. Region of origin in the Dominican Republic was considered given the variation of final liquids in the dialects of Santo Domingo and the Cibao region. By taking account of the participants' region of origin we can better understand the dynamics between the reference and bilinguallects.

Years residing in the United States: Traditionally, this variable is applied to those born outside of the United States. Participants are divided between those who have resided in the United States for 6–12 years. With all the participants being 18 or older, the 6–12 group can be considered more recent arrivals. The 13 or more group are much more established in the United States. It must be recognized that the number of years described in this dissertation are what participants themselves provided in the questionnaire. Upon further analysis, we must take into account the transnational nature of the Dominican community in New York.

In addition to traditional social variables mentioned above, I would like to elaborate more on additional data gathered from the questionnaire, particularly regarding in-group and out-group orientation (Otheguy and Zentella 2012). This factor allowed Otheguy and Zentella in their 2012 study to determine the degree of interactions of Mainlanders (Colombians, Ecuadorians, Mexicans) and Caribbeans (Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic) with one another and within their own groups. Otheguy and Zentella (2012) predicted that those who had an in-group orientation would demonstrate a higher degree of structural continuity with the reference lect while those who had an out-group orientation would be more susceptible to dialectal leveling. This dissertation does not make such comparisons. This dissertation does, however,

---

34 See Section 2.3.4
consider the orientation of Dominicans speakers with respect to its influence on language maintenance and language attitudes within their New York City community. Lastly, data was elicited about the participants’ attitudes towards Dominican Spanish, where they believed the “best” and “worst” varieties of Spanish were spoken, and the importance of speaking English and/or Spanish.

3.3.2 Linguistic factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variants</th>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final /l/ and /ɾ/</td>
<td>tap [ɾ]</td>
<td>Type of word</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trill [ɾ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lateral [l]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conjugated Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vocalized [i]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deletion [Ø]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retroflex [+]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment of the syllable</td>
<td>Word internal</td>
<td>Word Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following Feature</td>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vowel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Stressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unstressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 Linguistic variables and factor groups

The following section presents the linguistic variables analyzed in the current study. An impressionistic analysis was used to the determine the variants for final /l/ and /ɾ/.

**Variants for final /l/:** Within the data set variants include the lateral, tap, trill, and vocalization. The retroflex was negligible as a variant within the tokens for final /l/ representing 1 out of 2599 tokens.

<sup>35</sup> Approximants were included in the stop category in the data analysis.
Variants for final /ɾ/: The following are possible for the realization of /ɾ/ in the corpus: tap, trill, lateral, vocalized, deletion, and retroflex. All of these variants, except for retroflex, have been attested in both the Cibao and Santo Domingo dialects of Dominican Spanish (Alba 2004). The retroflex was included in the coding because of its appearance in the data and to take into consideration the influence of English.

Word Type/Grammatical Category: This factor considers whether the word in which the variable occurs is a noun, adjective, conjugated verb, infinitive, adverb, or other category. This final category accounts for high frequency words such as articles and pronouns el and él, and conjunctions such as porque. Prepositions were also included in the other category such as por.

Environment of the syllable: This variable looks at the position of the variants of /l/ and /ɾ/ within the syllable: word-final vs. word-internal.

Sound that follows: This factor specifies the sound following the realization of /l/ and /ɾ/: nasal, lateral, fricative, stop, vowel, or a pause.36

Stress: This factor determines whether the variant occurred in a tonic (stressed) or atonic (unstressed) syllable. All monosyllabic words such as flor and por were considered atonic.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has defined the goals of this study and the research questions that will be answered by the data analysis. I described my methods for data collection and elicitation. I have also outlined the extralinguistic and linguistic factors that will be considered during analysis. The factors being considered for analysis take into account the nature of the study. On the one hand, the data are being analyzed within a variationist framework based on more traditional social variables. On the other hand, the study uses a sociology of language approach by considering the

36 Following Alba’s (1990) model, manner of articulation is used rather than point of articulation.
environment in which Dominican Spanish finds itself, one where it is in contact with English and other varieties of Spanish. The following chapters will present the qualitative and quantitative analyses of the extracted data.
CHAPTER 4: LANGUAGE ATTITUDES OF DOMINICANS IN NEW YORK CITY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes language attitudes of Dominicans in the New York Metropolitan area towards their own varieties of Spanish and towards other dialects of Latin American and Peninsular Spanish. Based on the responses from Section O\textsuperscript{37} in the questionnaire, the first section of this chapter focuses on the participants’ attitudes and perception of their own dialects. The second section of the chapter also draws from participants’ responses from Section O in the questionnaire and describes their attitudes towards what they consider to be the “best” and “worst” varieties of Spanish.

4.2 Language Attitudes towards Dominican Spanish

In Section O of the questionnaire, participants were asked to identify characteristics that make Dominican Spanish unique. The open-ended question was used specifically to encourage more authentic answers without the influence of the researcher. Participants provided a wide range of answers. I divided their answers into five categories depending on the features they used to describe their dialect: phonetic, lexical, discursive, lexical/phonetic, discursive/phonetic. Phonetic here means any mention of pronunciation. Lexical refers to any words that the participants considered unique to Dominican Spanish or that are typical of Dominican speech. The discursive category describes phrases or sayings that participants associate with Dominican speech. The remaining categories, lexical/phonetic and discursive/phonetic, were for those responses that mentioned a combination of features of Dominican Spanish.

\textsuperscript{37} See Appendix: Questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonetic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical/Phonetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive/Phonetic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Characteristics of Dominican Spanish

The data show that Dominicans are aware of phonetic, lexical, and discursive features of their dialects. At first glance it would appear that participants provided the most examples within the discursive category (34.6%) with phonetic features (30.8%) closely behind. However, upon closer inspection, phonetic features appear slightly more in participants’ responses and often in conjunction with other categories. If we combine the categories of phonetic (30.8%), lexical/phonetic (7.7%), and discursive/phonetic (11.5%) we arrive at 50%. If we combine the discursive (34.6%) and discursive/phonetic (11.5%) categories, we arrive at 46%. This means that the participants rely more on phonetic features to distinguish their dialect from other varieties.

When talking about the phonetic features of Dominican Spanish, participants point to what they perceive to be fast or shortened speech. W12NYSD20 says Dominican Spanish is characterized by “la rapidez en cual se habla [the speed with which it is spoken]”. M8DR4SD25 describes Dominican Spanish as “un español tirado, callejero, rápido [a careless fast Spanish from the street]”. The speed of Dominican Spanish and the implicit characterization of it being careless, loud, and colloquial is prominent in other responses. M7DR7SD19 adds that Dominican Spanish is characterized by “el hablar rápido, usar la lengua coloquial a menudo [speaking quickly, using colloquial language at times]. He also says, “el hablar a alta voz [speaking loudly]”. W7DR13SD24 mentions, “el dominicano tiende a cortar palabras por la
rapidez con la que quiere hablar [Dominicans tend to shorten words because of the speed with which they want to speak]”. W3DR5SD16 notes that “las palabras se cortan, no se pronuncian completamente [words are shortened, they aren’t pronounced completely]”. W1DR14C7 offers the examples of “pa” for “para” (for) and “to” for “todo” (everything).

Most participants when mentioning shortened words or speech specifically refer to one of the most salient features of Dominican Spanish, final /s/ deletion (Alba 2004: 63). M4DR24SD13 writes that in Dominican Spanish “se comen las eses [the esses are eaten]”.

W14DR14C14 says that Dominican Spanish is characterized by “no pronunciar las s (como para plural) [not pronouncing esses (like for plural forms)]”. M2NYC19 comments that “dropping the s, la omisión de la s [the omission of s]” is common in Dominican Spanish. While participants’ awareness of final /s/ deletion is unsurprising given its frequency in the Dominican variety, I was not expecting responses to reflect an awareness of hypercorrection. W1DR14C7 says that a feature of Dominican Spanish is “quitar las eses o agregarlas [removing esses or adding them]”.

M2NYC19 differentiates Dominican Spanish from other varieties by the “overuse of the s”. His comment could be in line with an observation from W2NY8SD14 who offers a negative assessment of what is commonly associated with the perceived overuse of -/s/, “hablar fino”: “[el español dominicano] suena muy raro cuando se trata de hablar fino [Dominican Spanish sounds very weird when you try to speak in a refined way]”.

The participants’ observations on final /s/ deletion and insertion highlight that “hablar fino” can refer to distinct linguistic phenomena with different social implications. Toribio and Clemons (2020) explain that “hablar fino/fisno” can refer to two types of hypercorrection: quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative hypercorrection refers to the perceived overuse of etymological (underlying) -/s/, while qualitative hypercorrection refers to the insertion of a non-
etymological -/s/. They are two related phenomena but are motivated by different phonetic processes and are subject to different social consequences. Pronouncing the etymological -/s/, speaking an overly standard version of Spanish, particularly in informal situations, is viewed negatively in Dominican culture. If one inserts too many etymological -/s/ the phrase “comiste espaguetis” [you ate spaghetti]” may be used jokingly by fellow Dominicans to draw attention to and discourage the behavior. Toribio and Clemons (2020) point out that “elision is the prevailing realization of underlying /s/, inherited, disseminated, and imbued with authenticity. In a word, across the Caribbean nation, speakers are socialized with a Spanish variety in which coda -/s/ elision is the norm” (71).

It important to note the role of final /s/ deletion in signaling authenticity as Dominicans negotiate different, sometimes opposing sociolinguistic forces in New York City. There are outside pressures to speak more a standard Spanish given the relative status of Dominican Spanish in Latin America and Spain. However, there are social consequences and judgements within the Dominican community and when trying to “hablar fino”. Toribio and Clemons (2020) argue “whether in natural or diasporic contexts, people with Dominican origins are cognizant of /s/ elision and index in-group membership and out-group identities based on this feature. Studies and everyday exchanges confirm that the absence of this defining characteristic is judged to be inauthentic” (74). In-group membership is more important than out-group judgments of using a non-standard form of Spanish.

While final /s/ retention or deletion is linked to ideas of authentic Dominican speech and identity, participants revealed that final /ɾ/ and /l/ variation is not imbued with the same degree of social meaning as final /s/, except for vocalization in the Cibao region. Four participants specifically mention variation of final /ɾ/ and /l/ pronunciation. Participants refer to a variety of
phenomena related to final liquid variation: lateralization, rhotacization, and vocalization. W16DR39 says Dominican Spanish is characterized by “la sustitución de las l, r, o i entre sílabas, y la sustitución de la r por l [the substitution of l, r, or i between syllables and the substitution of r for l]”. While vocalization of final liquids is mostly associated with the Dominican Republic’s Cibao region, lateralization of final /ɾ/ is associated with but not exclusive to the Santo Domingo Region. Regional differences are implicitly seen from the point of view of the standard. If the Dominican standard is produced from the capital city of Santo Domingo, then only non-Santo Domingo dialects are seen as exhibiting any differences. Thus, lateralization of -/ɾ/ is not seen outside of the Dominican norm since speakers of both regions lateralize.

Ideas of the standard and Dominicanness operate differently with final /ɾ/ and /l/ when compared to final /s/ usage. “Hablar fisno” does not prescribe or describe final liquid usage. While maintaining etymological -/s/ can result in derision, one can argue that maintaining etymological -/ɾ/ and -/l/ is not explicitly associated with the elite classes and those who wish to be perceived above their socioeconomic class or social group. Additionally, the indexicality of -/ɾ/ and -/l/ is not linked to in-group identity as is the case with final /s/. Maintenance, lateralization, rhoticism, and vocalization all fit within authentic ways of speaking Dominican Spanish.

In addition to phonetic features, participants indicate that Dominican Spanish can be distinguished by its vocabulary and phrases. Participants included various examples of what they consider unique Dominican words and phrases in their responses to the questionnaire. W14DR14C14 writes, “usamos muchos ‘dichos’ para hablar y también animales para describir características por ejemplo ‘perro’, ‘tigre’ y ‘caballo’ [we use many ‘sayings’ when talking and we also use animals to describe characteristics for example ‘dog’, ‘tiger’ and ‘horse’]”.
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W10NYSD18 says, “el español dominicano es único. Nosotros nos inventamos palabras pero me encanta” [our Spanish is unique. We make up words, but I love it]”. M3DRNY8C11 also mentions the use of non-standard words that makes Dominican unique: “[usamos] muchas palabras que no están en el diccionario [we use a lot of words that aren’t in the dictionary]”.

Participants also list phrases that distinguish Dominican Spanish from other varieties: “vaina, que lo que, está jevi [thing, what’s up, that’s cool/fine]” (M4DR24SD13). W1738SD10 lists “dime a ver, que lo que, coño, qué vaina, ¿en qué tú tá? [what’s going on, what’s up, damn/shit, how annoying, what are you up to?]”. One participant did mention the use of English in Dominican Spanish. W5NYSD25 says that Dominican Spanish is characterized by “generalmente hablar usando palabras en inglés a la misma vez que hablar el español [generally speaking using words in English at the same time you speak Spanish]”. It is unclear which specific bilingual phenomena she is referring to.

Participants’ observations reflect not only an awareness of phonetic, lexical, and discursive features, but also a sensitivity to the social meanings the use of said features have in the Dominican community. Some participants consider many of the features discussed in this section to be positive and unique aspects of Dominican Spanish. Others viewed final /s/ deletion and insertion, along with colloquialisms and rapid speech as a careless and substandard form of Spanish. Despite a perception of impartiality, participants’ responses are imbued with implicit judgments and biases concerning Dominican Spanish. In the following section, I will examine what participants consider to be the “best” and “worst” Spanish and the language ideologies that inform them.
Section 4.3 “Best” Spanish

What participants consider the “best” Spanish is influenced by a variety of language ideologies and attitudes that collide in a metropolitan area with Spanish speakers from all over the world. The confluence of ideologies plays a major role in the language attitudes that are adopted by and reinforced by Dominicans within their own community. Pan regional Latin American norms value speech that matches standard orthography and comes from large cities as opposed to rural areas (Pountain 2016). In other words, correctness is strongly associated with pronouncing words exactly as they are spelled. Less value will be attributed to a speaker who produces a non-standard variant that doesn’t match the spelling such as final /s/ deletion: \( e[s]pecial \rightarrow e[\emptyset]pecial \) or final /s/ lateralization \( amo[r] \rightarrow amo[l] \). Pan regional Latin American preferences for speech that matches standard orthography naturally creates a situation where speech that is less standard would be disfavored. This value system is key in creating a linguistic hierarchy where some varieties of speech are perceived to be better than others. An important institution in creating and maintaining the idea of standard Spanish is the Real Academia de la Lengua Española (The Royal Academy of the Spanish Language).

The Real Academia de la Lengua Española (RAE) is a multinational organization whose outward role is to maintain and regulate the national varieties of Spanish both within and across member countries. Linguistic hierarchies in the Spanish-speaking world reveal that certain varieties, and by extension, their people/countries, hold a privileged status. An example of the role of the RAE in maintaining certain languages ideologies comes from the Spanish president of the RAE Darío Villanueva. On February 15, 2015 in a radio interview at Uniminuto Radio Station in Bogotá, Colombia, Villanueva praised Colombian Spanish saying, “los colombianos hablan tan bien el español que sorprende positivamente la habilidad con que se expresan y eso
nos estimula a mejorar y a darnos cuenta de los defectos y errores que nosotros mismos podamos cometer [Colombians speak Spanish so well that the ability with which they express themselves pleasantly surprises us, and that inspires us to get better and recognize our own defects and errors that we ourselves may make]” (Carter and Callesano 2018: 70). At first glance, one could interpret this assessment as Villanueva trying to ingratiate himself to the Colombian hosts and listeners. His comments may appear as simple flattery, but they are also an example of how language ideologies are perpetuated in the Spanish-speaking world. Paffey (2012) describes the impact of choosing one variety over another has on the construction and propagation of language ideologies:

> Selection of a vernacular to be the standard variety within a national context might seem at first to be a matter of endorsing one variety and promoting its use, but it also means that all other varieties are deselected and their speakers—implicitly or explicitly—excluded from enjoying the status accorded to the standard (49).

By selecting Colombian Spanish as a standard to which one should aspire, Villanueva inadvertently deselected other varieties of Spanish.

> Colombian Spanish seems to be especially privileged, being considered “among the best, most pure, or most refined varieties of Spanish” (Carter and Callesano 2018: 70). The authors also point out that the closer one is to the orthographic standard, coupled with associations of the economic middle class and European roots, the more positively a variety is perceived (Carter and Callesano 2018: 70). These intersecting ideologies are reflected in the responses of the participants in my study.
Participants overall favor South America/Latin America at 30.8%. The other two varieties that appear in the data are Santo Domingo/La Capital at 19.2% and Spain at 15.4%. These results are not surprising given that Spain and Latin America, particularly Colombia represent ideal forms of language use. For the 19.2% of participants who favor Dominican Spanish, it is important to note that, as expected, it was the variety of Santo Domingo, not that of El Cibao, that is preferred. A small percentage of the participant group (11.5%) do not explicitly mention a dialect but said that the best Spanish comes from those who have some formal education. Three participants (11.5%) also say there is no best Spanish. The remaining three participants (11.5%) opted to not answer the question.

Those participants who prefer Latin America specifically mention Colombia or Argentina in their responses. W15PR4MSD26 says, “pienso que en Colombia se habla el mejor español [I think in Colombia the best Spanish is spoken]”. W3DR5SD16 agrees that “en Colombia se habla mejor [in Colombia they speak better]”. W5NYSD25 says, “el mejor español para mí se habla en Argentina [the best Spanish for me is spoken in Argentina]”. Spain also enjoys a level of prestige among participants. W10NYSD18 believes that “el mejor español se habla en España o Colombia [the best Spanish is spoken in Spain or Colombia]”.

---

I wished to see if there was a connection between the positive attitudes towards Colombian Spanish and actual interaction with the group. The data show that those who choose South America/Latin America have some interactions 37.5% (3 people), while 62.5% (5 people) have little interaction with Colombians. The questionnaire does not ask that participants share the degree of interaction with Spaniards. However, we can infer that participants had little to no exposure to Spaniards, given their relatively low numbers in New York City. In the 2010 Census only .3% of all New York City residents identified as Spaniard 17,793 (.2%), Spanish 11,935 (.1%), or Spanish American 1,110 (.0%)\(^\text{39}\). Colombians also made up a small portion of New York City residents in the 2010 Census at 94,723 (1.2%)\(^\text{40}\). Despite a small population and little interactions with speakers from these groups, Dominicans in the study ascribe a higher degree of prestige to Spanish dialects compared to their own. The data suggest that degree of interaction with a group or dialect does not correspond with the perceived prestige of said group or dialect.

Five participants (19.2%) mention that the Dominican Republic has the “best” Spanish specifically referring to the capital city of Santo Domingo. W4B512SD9, herself from Santo Domingo, states, “en la capital se habla mejor y el peor en los campos/El Cibao [in the capital they speak better and the worst in the countryside/the Cibao]”. MDR6C12 believes that “in the capital they speak the best Spanish in DR. But overall, the best Spanish is spoken in Spain”. W1DR14C7 doesn’t mention specific countries or cities but says, “la gente educada habla el mejor español. La gente del campo habla el peor [educated people speak the best Spanish. People from the countryside speak the worst (Spanish)]”. It isn’t clear if the two participants are referring specifically to educated Dominicans or educated people in general. The aforementioned


\(^{40}\) Compare to the Dominican population in 2013: 747,473 (Section 2.7).
attitudes reinforce the ideology that capital cities/cultural centers and, in turn, their residents have the “best” Spanish when compared to speakers from non-metropolitan and rural areas.

Of the five participants who chose Santo Domingo/La Capital as the having the best Spanish, 80% are themselves from the region. Spain is considered to have the “best” Spanish solely by four participants from Santo Domingo. The three participants who chose “educated people” as having the “best” Spanish are from El Cibao. Participants from both Santo Domingo and El Cibao have the most in common in choosing South America/Latin America. Participants from Santo Domingo are overrepresented in the data set at 62.5% compared to El Cibao at 37.5%. Thirty-one percent of participants from Santo Domingo and thirty of those from El Cibao looked outward and chose Latin American Spanish, specifically Colombian as the “best”.

Three participants (11.5%) say there is no “best” Spanish. For these participants one variety of Spanish isn’t necessarily better or worse than another, rather Spanish varies based on culture, context, and personal style. W12NYSD20 writes, “yo no creo que hay un solo lugar que hable el mejor español porque cada país latino habla diferentemente por su cultura y eso determina parte de su lenguaje [I don’t think there’s one specific place that speaks the best Spanish because each Latino country speaks differently because of their culture and that determines their language]”. W14DR14C14 explains, “todo depende del contexto dentro del grupo. Existe el “estándar” que es aceptable para propósitos profesionales. Pero no creo que un grupo hable mejor o peor que otro, simplemente lo que funciona para cada quien [Everything depends on the context within the group. There’s the standard that’s acceptable for professional purposes. But I don’t think that a group speaks better than another, simply it’s about what works for the individual person]”. W11NYC18 says, “everyone has their style of Spanish”.
4.4 “Worst” Spanish

In the previous section I argued that what is considered the “best” Spanish corresponds to standard orthography and is strongly associated with large, usually capital cities. The next conclusion would be that the “worst” varieties of Spanish deviate from standard orthography and are spoken outside of big cities in smaller rural areas. Participants’ responses reflect these assumptions about the “worst” Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region or Social Group</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street/Slang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country (El campo)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no “worst” Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 “Worst” Spanish according to participant

There is overlap between the two participants who say the “worst” Spanish is spoken in the Dominican Republic and the two who indicated that the “worst” Spanish is from the country (el campo). Both of these attitudes are directed inwards towards the variety spoken in their own communities. W4BS12SD9 specifically names El Cibao when she mentions “los campos”. In a pan American language hierarchy where countries like Colombia and Argentina are at the top, the Caribbean varieties normally enjoy less prestige⁴¹. Despite the home dialect being a source of identity, “speakers of Caribbean varieties often share these negative perceptions and reproduce stigmatized attitudes about their home dialects after immigrating to the United States (Carter and Callesano 2018:71). This contradictory relationship with Dominican Spanish where the language

⁴¹ Alfaraz (2018: 53–54) describes Spanish, Colombian, and Argentinian varieties being evaluated positively among both Cubans in Cuba and in the US (Miami) diaspora. I discuss Cuban attitudes towards other varieties Caribbean Spanish later in this section.
variety is key to the building of and membership within the community, while also being viewed as substandard when compared to other varieties of Spanish, reflects the complex social and historical dynamics that create and sustain language attitudes.

The literature supports the idea that language attitudes function as covert social evaluations of groups of people (Lippi-Green 1997; Paffey 2012; Suárez Büdenbender 2011; 2013; Thompson and Lamboy 2012). Previously I mentioned how participants view Spanish spoken in el campo/El Cibao as inferior. While few participants explain what makes Spanish from El Cibao worse than others, M5DR612 offers some insight, “people from the campo have little education”. Along with other participants, he highlights two binaries common in the responses: educated vs. uneducated, educated vs. street.

There is an assumption that people from el campo are not educated. Like M5DR6C12’s assessment, W1DR14C7 says, “la gente educada habla el mejor español. La gente del campo habla el peor [educated people speak the best Spanish. People from the country speak the worst]”. M3DRNY8C11 compares the school and the street, “en la escuela el mejor, en la calle el peor [at school the best, in the street the worst]”. These assessments on the quality of one’s Spanish cannot be easily divorced from an individual and the communities to which they belong. W6DR14C47 is more neutral in her assessment on the influence of education on one’s Spanish, “el mejor español se habla en los países donde las personas se educan y tienen un nivel de personas que están alfabetizadas [the best Spanish is spoken where people are educated and where they have a level of people who are literate]”.

Just as it was unsurprising for participants to favor Latin American and Castilian varieties over the Dominican one, it is equally unsurprising that Spanish spoken in the United States and Puerto Rico would be chosen as the least favorable. The responses “USA” (19.2%) and “Puerto
Rico (15.4%)” are connected given they reflect attitudes that, while not necessarily created in the USA, are specifically reinforced in a multilingual, multicultural diasporic environment. US Latinos face pressures from monolingual speakers of English to shift to English like other generations of immigrants have done in the past, while also facing pressure from monolingual speakers of Spanish to speak ‘pure’ Spanish, free of incursions from English” (Casielles Suárez 2017: 147). The idea of US Spanish being impure, full of incursions from English, leads to an assessment that US Spanish, and therefore one’s knowledge of Spanish is deficient. Take the case of code-switching. Fernández Dobao (2018) in her study on code-switching in the Spanish heritage classroom explains “code-switching is, even in educational settings, often stigmatized, misinterpreted as a consequence of lack of linguistic knowledge” (178). This misinterpretation fails to recognize the role code-switching plays in identity and self-expression (Lipski 2008; Toribio 2000a).

The idea of linguistic purity is common in the participants’ responses. W7DR13SD24 believes, “en la República Dominicana se habla mejor el español. En los Estados Unidos el idioma es maltratado porque tienden [a] añadir palabras que no existen y son derivadas de idioma inglés [in the Dominican Republic better Spanish is spoken. In the US the language (Spanish) is mistreated because they tend to add words that don’t exist or are derived from English”. The negative assessment about the impurity of US Spanish is in line with W10NYSD18’s assessment that “el mejor español se habla en España o en Colombia [the best Spanish is spoken in Spain or Colombia”. W15PR4SD26 agrees that the best Spanish spoken in Colombia. The worst Spanish in her opinion is spoken in Puerto Rico. In the case of Puerto Rican Spanish, negative attitudes towards the variety could stem from the myth that it is heavily influenced and in turn tainted by English (Zentella 1982: 43). Such an anglicized form of
Spanish would, in turn, be considered less pure than those varieties of Spain and Andean Latin America. It is also possible that W15PRSD26’s attitudes towards Puerto Rican Spanish are shaped by her family’s immigration journey, which started in Puerto Rico before eventually arriving in New York. When examining attitudes towards US Spanish and Puerto Rican Spanish, it is also important to recognize the social and historical dynamics between and among Dominicans and Puerto Rican communities.

Puerto Ricans and Dominicans of various generations are in contact both in the mainland US where English is the dominant language and in Puerto Rico where Spanish is the norm. Suárez-Büdenbender (2013) found that social biases played a role in the perception and identification of Dominican speakers by Puerto Rican speakers in Puerto Rico. She found that “the linguistic identification of a speaker as Dominican already entails within the listener the preconceived notion of a less educated, poor immigrant” (2013: 130). In the United States, particularly in the New York Metropolitan area, Dominicans are part of a sizeable community that enjoys a different social status than their compatriots in Puerto Rico. In addition to the communities Dominicans and Puerto Ricans inhabit, one must consider the role that Spanish plays in identity.

Lamboy (2011) in his research on Puerto Ricans in Florida found that when it came to the process of creating and maintaining an identity “language is one of the various elements that come into play in this process, and research has demonstrated that Spanish is evidently adopted as a symbol, but its maintenance is not necessarily adopted as a behavior or practice” (78). Puerto Ricans can use Spanish as one of many ways to signal their identity. It is not however necessary that Puerto Ricans speak Spanish to identify themselves as Puerto Rican. Lamboy (2004) in earlier research on first- and second-generation Puerto Ricans and Dominicans
explained that “Puerto Ricans believe that Spanish is more necessary to belong to the Hispanic/Latino community than to the Puerto Rican community. Dominicans have the opposite opinion” (90). In line with Lamboy’s assessment, I would argue that Dominican identity in the United States is more marked by a complex transnational identity coupled with stronger language loyalty to Spanish (Duany 2008). Dominant language ideologies of the standard coupled with attitudes towards language maintenance and usage are an additional layer that further complicates the reasons as to why Dominicans might evaluate Puerto Rican Spanish negatively.

Alfaraz’s (2018) study on language attitudes in Cuba and the diaspora in the United States may offer some insight into the complexities of Dominican-Puerto Rican dynamics in New York City. Cubans in Havana indicated that other varieties of Caribbean Spanish, in this case Dominican and Puerto Rican, as being the least correct. Additionally, Havana residents also said that Cuban Spanish was one of the least correct varieties of Spanish. This differed from Cubans in the Miami diaspora who had more positive attitudes towards their dialect. Alfaraz (2018) explains that the stigmatization of Caribbean dialects may stem from “contact with black and impoverished people, [which in turn influences] its acceptance among its speakers” (55). I would assert that similar dynamics are at play when forming language ideologies and attitudes for Dominicans in the Dominican Republic and in the US. A comparison of the language attitudes between mainland and diasporic Dominicans would help answer questions about whether negative attitudes towards Puerto Rican Spanish already existed in the Dominican Republic and whether said attitudes were heavily influenced by contact in New York City.

In section 4.3.1 I discussed how those who had positive opinions about Colombian Spanish had little contact with Colombians in their daily lives. I wished to see if there was a
correlation between negative attitudes about Puerto Rican Spanish and contact with Puerto Ricans in the New York Metropolitan Area. Of the 15.4% who chose Puerto Rico as having the worst Spanish, 50% had a lot of contact with Puerto Ricans and 50% had some contact. The questionnaire only asks how much contact the participants have with certain groups i.e., Puerto Ricans, Peruvians, etc. It does not explicitly ask in what language those interactions occur. When compared to the results of Section 4.3.1 on the “best” Spanish crossed with language use with Colombians, this data would suggest that negative attitudes towards Puerto Rican Spanish and interactions with said group are related. However, interaction with Puerto Ricans is much more likely because the majority of Dominican participants reside in the Bronx and Manhattan where Puerto Ricans also represent a significant portion of the population (Bergad 2014).

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter explored the language attitudes of Dominicans in New York. I provided a detailed description of what Dominicans consider the most salient features of their dialect. The participants are aware of the phonetic, lexical, and discursive features that distinguish Dominican Spanish from other varieties. With respect to the “best” and “worst” varieties of Spanish, the data suggest the degree of interaction with certain groups, in this case Colombians and Puerto Ricans, are not determining factors in participants’ attitudes. The participants’ responses show positive attitudes towards the dialect of the capital of the Dominican Republic Santo Domingo, Colombian, Argentine, and Castilian varieties of Spanish, and negative attitudes towards Puerto Rican and United States-based varieties of Spanish. In terms of social groups, there was a preference for Spanish spoken at school or educated people over those who spoke a street or

---

42 Otheguy and Zentella (2012: 149) note that “frequent interaction with the Spanish of other groups, as we have seen, is part of the life of only some Latinos in New York”.
country variety. The results suggest that predominant language ideologies are more important in determining and forming language attitudes, rather than actual interactions with the aforementioned groups.
CHAPTER 5: VARIATION OF FINAL /ɾ/ AND /l/ IN NEW YORK DOMINICAN SPANISH

5.1 Introduction

This chapter offers a quantitative analysis of the behavior of final /ɾ/ and /l/ in New York Dominican Spanish. Previous studies (Alba 1990; González 1987; Henríquez Ureña 1940; Jiménez Sabater 1975; López Morales 1992) focus on the Santo Domingo and El Cibao dialects in the Dominican Republic. The current study takes into account a unique sociolinguistic environment outside of the country of origin, New York City, where different Dominican dialects are coming into contact with one another, with other varieties of Spanish, and with English. The study considers extralinguistic and linguistic factors. Social factors include gender, birthplace, region of origin in DR, age at arrival, and age at the time of interview. The linguistic factors analyzed are type of word, syllable environment, following feature, and syllable stress. The chapter concludes with a summary of the overall trends in final /ɾ/ and /l/ variation in New York Dominican Spanish.

5.2 Overall Results for Variants of /ɾ/

5171 tokens were entered into SPSS. Table 5.1 shows the general distribution of the variants of /ɾ/. Participants favor rhotic variants overall with a combined total of 42.8 %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of /ɾ/</th>
<th>Frequency (Tokens)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tap</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trill</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocalized</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deletion</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retroflex</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Overall results for variants of /ɾ/
Overall participants prefer maintenance with the tap at 26.9% and the trill at 15.9% for a combined total of 42.8%.

(1) “Yo no podía entender eso, como te daba vergüenza”
(W14DR14C14)

The lateral is also common in the data set at 32.3%.

(2) “El hablabla español pero tenía los ojos velados”
(M7DR7SD19)

Deletion of final /ɾ/ occurs 22.2% of the time.

(3) “Aquí vamos a tener un que tomar una decisión”
(W6DR14C17)

The retroflex variant is rare in the data set with most tokens coming from one participant at 2.3%

(4) “Va a ser difícil pero voy a tratar”
(M2NYC19)

Vocalization is the rarest variant in the data set occurring only 0.4% of the time.

(5) “Oh, ¿qué me voy a poner? ¿Qué marca?”
(W13NYC18)

These participants represent a variety of demographic groups, which we will explore in detail in the following section.

5.3 Social Factors

5.3.1 Gender

Sociolinguistic variants of final liquids and final /s/ have been found to occur across gender lines with women being more linguistically conservative than men (Alba 1990; Labov 2001; Lipski 2008). The data below support the argument that women are more conservative in their speech than men. We see in Table 5.2 that women are more likely to maintain rhotic variants than men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.8 (284)</td>
<td>1.7 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32.8 (1105)</td>
<td>23.5 (793)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X²=924.594; p=<.001)
Table 5.2 Gender crossed with variant of /ɾ/

Women produce the tap at 32.8% and the trill at 23.5%. Compare that to men at 15.8% and 1.7% for the tap and trill variants. Women’s preference for the rhotic does not preclude them from using non-standard variants in their speech. Women in the data set lateralize final /ɾ/ at 26.5% and delete it at 16.9%. Despite a conservative nature to their speech when compared to men, women have also been found to be the agents of change and innovators in their linguistic communities (Labov 2001; López Morales 1983; Pountain 2016). Among men, the lateral is the preferred variant representing 43.2% of all tokens. Deletion is also common among male participants with the null variant representing 32% of tokens. The retroflex is rare in the data set at 6.5% and is produced almost exclusively by one male speaker.

5.3.2 Birthplace

When looking at dialectal contact in a multigenerational and multidialectal sociolinguistic environment, it is important to consider a participant’s birthplace. Participants were either born in the Dominican Republic, the New York Metropolitan Area or another US City.44 This factor, along with age of arrival of foreign-born, offers insight into a participant’s sociolinguistic generation, which in turn has implications on a language acquisition, acculturation, and identity.

---

43 The numbers in parenthesis represent all tokens of final /ɾ/.
44 See section 3.2.1 for more information on participants’ birthplace.
In Table 5.3 we see that the factor birthplace yields variation similar to those found in the overall results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other US City</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((X^2=245.404; \ p=<.001)\)

Table 5.3 Birthplace crossed with variant of /ɾ/

Both New York Born (NYB) and Dominican Born (DB) participants prefer to maintain the rhotic, followed by lateralization and deletion. NYB produce the rhotic form as either a tap (24.7%) or a trill (13.9%) at a rate of 38.6%. For DB, the degree of maintenance is slightly higher with final /ɾ/ being produced as a tap (28.9%) or a trill (18.5%) with a combined total of 47.4%. The differences in lateralization are smaller. NYB lateralize at 30.1% compared to 32.1% among DB participants. Deletion also occurs at similar rates. Compare 25% for NYB and 20.2% for DB. Those two participants born in another US city show a preference for lateralization when compared to NYB and DB participants.

Given the differences that the factor gender yielded in the previous section, I decided to add it as another layer of analysis. The crosstabulation in Table 5.2 reveals that gender is playing a role along with birthplace in the sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/.
When comparing men born in New York and the Dominican Republic, the groups mainly differ in the lateralization of final /ɾ/: NYB at 26.9% vs DB (56.2%). All other variants were relatively similar among men except for the retroflex from one participant at 14.5%. Data from female participants offer a different picture.

Women from both groups prefer rhotic forms: NYB at 28.2 % for the tap, 20.7 for the trill vs DB at 38.6 % for tap and 29.4% for the trill. The main difference between the two groups is that the NYB women lateralize much more frequently than the DB group: 32% vs 17.1% respectively. In isolation, birthplace only shows trends reflected in the overall results of this dissertation. When crossed with gender, we see that the situation is a bit more nuanced with birthplace having the opposite effect in gender groups. NYB men are more conservative than their DB counterparts. Conversely, US-born female participants, both in New York and other cities, are less conservative than those born in the Dominican Republic. This behavior is in line
with the argument that Dominican Spanish in New York is under fewer prescriptive pressures due to an “unconstrained sociolinguistic environment”\textsuperscript{45}.

5.3.3. Region of origin

Dialectal studies have described sociolinguistic variation of final liquids in the Spanish-speaking Caribbean\textsuperscript{46}. In the case of the Dominican Republic, this dissertation considers the region of origin of the participants: the Santo Domingo region where lateralization is favored as opposed to the Cibao Region where the vocalized, and highly stigmatized, variant is documented to be produced among speakers. Considering the factor region of origin allows us to identify and compare features from the reference lect with those found in the contact lect. The data in Table 5.6 show vocalization of final \( /r/ \), one of the most distinct features of Dominican Spanish, only occurs in the speech of participants accounting for 1.1% of all tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin in the Dominican Republic</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of ( /r/ ) (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo Region</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cibao Region</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((X^2=347.038; p=<.001)\)

Table 5.6 Region of origin in the Dominican Republic crossed with variant of \( /r/ \)

Overall, participants from El Cibao prefer maintenance (49.4%) as either a tap variant at 32.4% or trill at 17%. Speakers from the Santo Domingo region show almost equal usage of the rhotic or lateralized variant. Santo Domingo speakers produce the tap at 23.5% and the trill at 15.2%

\textsuperscript{45} See section 2.7.1 for more information on Lipski’s (2008) assessment of Spanish in the United States.

\textsuperscript{46} See section 2.3.1 for more information on dialect variation in Caribbean Spanish.
for a combined total of 38.7%. Speakers from this region lateralize at 37.8%. There is no major
difference between the amount of deletion based on the region. Santo Domingo speakers delete
final /ɾ/ at 23.5% and speakers from El Cibao at 20.1%. In terms of characteristics associated
with specific dialects, the data show that vocalization is rare in the speech of speakers from El
Cibao, while lateralization is more common among speakers from the Santo Domingo region.

5.3.4 Age at the time of interview

Considering a participant’s age at the time of the interview allows us to look at how
differences within age groups manifest themselves in the sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/.

Table 5.7 describes variation of /ɾ/ across three age groups: 18–25, 26–40, 41 and up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at the time of the interview (# of participants)</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25 (16)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40 (7)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and up (3)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X²=253.464; p=<.001)

Table 5.7 Age at the time of interview crossed with variant of /ɾ/

At first glance, the data would suggest that age groups differ most significantly in terms of
maintenance and lateralization, with the 26-40 group preferring lateralization (42.6%) over the
tap (23%) and the trill (13%). The 18-25 group produce the rhotic as either a tap (28.8%) or a
trill (16.2%) 45% of the time. The oldest group maintains final /ɾ/ the most as either at tap (29%)
or a trill (23.5) for a combined total of 52.5%. The rates of deletion are similar across all groups.

While it is unsurprising that the oldest age cohort would be more conservative in their
speech, it is however unexpected that the 26-40 would lateralize so much more than the youngest
group. Since lateralization is strongly associated with male participants, I decided to run an additional crosstabulation, after which it became clear then men were skewing the data towards higher rates of lateralized variants. Table 5.8 describes the variation of final /ɾ/ crossed with gender and age at the time of the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Male)</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of interview</td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2=277.190; \ p=<.001\)

Table 5.8 Age at time of interview crossed with variant of /ɾ/ crossed with gender (male)\(^{47}\)

Males in the 26–40 group produce the lateral 56.2% compared to women at 25.6% in the same age group. Differences within male participants also occur with the tap. Males 18–25 maintain final /ɾ/ as either a tap (21.4%) or a trill (2.1%) for a combined total of 23.5%. The 26–40 group maintain the /ɾ/ even less at a combined total of 12.4%. The retroflex accounts for 14.5%, which is produced by one participant.

In Table 5.9 we see the data from female participants tell a different story.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Female)</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of interview</td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and up</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2=74.515; \ p=<.001\)

Table 5.9 Age at time of interview crossed with variant of /ɾ/ crossed with gender (female)

\(^{47}\) Due to the small number of male participants, the variable “age at the time of interview” and “birthplace” overlap. Those born in the US were those were 18–25 years old. Participants born in the Dominican Republic were also 26–40 years old at the time of the interview.
Differences among female participants occur across all age groups and variants of /ɾ/. In general, all age cohorts prefer maintenance: the 18–25 group at 53.7%, the 26–40 group at 65.2% and the 41 and up group at 53.2%. All groups also lateralize at similar rates: the 18–25 group at 28.2%, the 26–40 group produce a lateral at 25.6%, while the 41 and up group lateralize final /ɾ/ the least at 22.3%. The oldest group does however delete final /ɾ/ the most at 25.4%. Compare this to the 18-25 group at 17.9% and the 26–40 group at 12.8%.

The intersection of gender and age at the time of the interview show different patterns emerging. Younger Dominican men tend to be more conservative than their older counterparts. For women, the differences vary depending on the variant of /ɾ/ in question. We see increased lateralization occurring as participants get younger. We also note that deletion occurs the most in the oldest age group and that the highest degree of maintenance occurs in the middle group. If we are to look at women in terms of how conservative their speech is across age groups, we could argue that all groups prefer maintenance, but that they distinguish themselves most in terms of lateralization and deletion.

5.3.5 Age at arrival of foreign-born

The variable age at arrival of foreign-born participants allows us to consider the role of sociolinguistic generation in variation of final /ɾ/ in New York Dominican Spanish. Those who were born in the US and those who came to the US between the ages 0–5 are generation 2. Participants who came to the US between the ages of 6 and 12 are generation 1.5. Participants who came during or after adolescence, ages 13 and up, are considered generation 1.

Sociolinguistic generation is crucial when looking at bilingualism, especially in terms of language acquisition. When it comes to sociolinguistic variation, however, the research has

---

48 See section 2.4.1
found that the critical period of language acquisition does not play a role in dialectal leveling (Aarón and Hernández 2007). Otheguy and Zentella point out that the susceptibility to the type of out-group influence that underlies dialectal leveling lasts well beyond the age of native-like acquisition (2012: 32). For that reason, they find it useful to make a distinction between those who came as a child and those who came as a teenager.

Table 5.10 shows that the factor age at arrival yields similar results to those found in the overall frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at arrival of foreign-born</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and up</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-born</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($X^2=481.858;\ p<.001$)

Table 5.10 Age at arrival of foreign-born cross with variant of /ɾ/

In general, all groups prefer maintenance of final /ɾ/: 0–5 group at 53%, 6–12 group at 50%, the 13 and up group at 40%, the US-born group at 35.8%. Rates of lateralization and deletion also follow general patterns: the lateral is the second most preferred variant followed by deletion. Differences between rates of lateralization and deletion are also slight ranging from 1–5% between age groups.

The chi square test indicates that age at arrival is statistically significant, but upon interpretation of the results, a question arises. If we compare generation groups, we will conclude that the 0–5 group overwhelmingly prefer to conserve final /ɾ/ at 53%. We could say the same for the 6–12 group with maintenance at 50%. The 13 and up group maintain the final /ɾ/ slightly less
at 40% and the US-born at 35.8%. How is it that the most conservative group is generation 1.5 when the expectation would be that generation 1 (13–up) would adhere more to the norms of the reference lect?

We have seen thus far that gender also played a heavy role in maintenance of final /ɾ/. By adding it as another layer of analysis along with age at arrival, we see that gender interacts with other variables as we see with male participants in Table 5.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Male)</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at arrival of foreign-born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and up</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-born</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X^2 = 1227.416; p = <.001)
Table 5.1.1 Age at arrival of foreign born crossed with variant of r crossed with gender (male)

There were too few participants in the 0-5 and US-born groups within gender for me to consider them in overall trends. There were however enough participants in the 6–12 group (3) and the 13 and up group (4) to allow for comparison. The 6–12 group is more conservative than the 13 and up group. While this trend is similar to that occurring between women of these generations, these two generations of men are less alike in their behavior than women. Male participants from generation 1.5 maintain the /ɾ/ at 30.5%. Compare that to those men who arrived at the age of 13 and up at 11.5%. The difference can also be seen with the lateral. Generation 1.5 lateralizes final /ɾ/ at 41.3% compared to generation 1 which produces the lateral at 52.1%. The oldest group also deletes final /ɾ/ more at 36.1%, while generation 1.5 does the same at 28.2%.
Table 5.11 shows that women from generation 1.5 (6–12 group) are the most conservative maintaining final /ɾ/ at 65.4%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Female)</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at arrival of foreign-born</td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and up</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X²=335.716; p=<.001)

Table 5.12 Age at arrival of foreign-born crossed with variant of /ɾ/ crossed with gender

Close behind is generation 1 (13 and up group) at combined total of 59.4%. Within generation 2, the 0–5 group consists of only one participant. The US-born group consists of 6 participants and differentiates itself the most from generation 1 and 1.5. The US-born group maintains the /ɾ/ and lateralizes at similar rates (40.5% and 37.5%). They also delete final /ɾ/ more than the other generations at 26.5%.

5.3.6 Years in the US

Regarding dialectal contact and multidialectal bilingual communities in the United States, research shows that the longer someone has been in the US, the higher their level of bilingualism tends to be (Klee and Lynch 2009; Otheguy and Zentella 2012: 32). The increase in bilingualism is fertile ground for encountering a variety of contact phenomena such as code-switching, borrowing, and simplification49. While syntactic and lexical phenomena can be attributed to increased bilingualism and time in the United States, sociolinguistic variation of a bilingual group is more closely related to ideological and societal pressures stemming from the history of

49 See Section 2.4.2
communities in a particular area, dominant language ideologies, and intra-group relations (Aarón and Hernández 2007; Potowski 2008). As we consider these social factors affecting final /ɾ/ pronunciation, we must keep in mind that Dominicans in New York speak Spanish in a sociolinguistic context with a unique set of in-group and out-group pressures.

Table 5.13 describes the rates of final /ɾ/ variation based on the number of years a participant has lived in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in the US</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12 years</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more years</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X²=230.606; p=<.001)

Table 5.13 Years in the US crossed with variant of /ɾ/

Both groups maintain final /ɾ/ at almost equal levels. The 6–12 group produce a tap (29.1%) or a trill (13.1%) at 42.2%. Similarly, the 13 or more group pronounce final /ɾ/ as either a tap (25.5%) or a trill (17.7%) 43.2% of the time. The differences between the two groups become more apparent with lateralization and deletion. The 6–12 group lateralizes less than the 13 or more group: 27.3% vs 35.5%. The opposite is true for deletion. Those who have only been in the US for 6–12 years delete final /ɾ/ at almost double the rate of the more established group, 30.5% and 17% respectively. We can recall that differences in lateralization and deletion are most visible along gender lines.

Table 5.14 shows different trends among male participants.
Men within the 6–12 group maintain final /ɾ/ more than at 20.7% compared to the 13 or more group at 13.4%. Lateralization occurs more within the 13 and more group at 47.8% compared to the 6–12 group where it occurs at 39.5%. The more recent group delete final /ɾ/ more at 39.7% while those who have been in the US longer delete final /ɾ/ at 22.4%. I recognize that one participant is skewing the data in the 13 or more group. The retroflex variant comprises 14.6% of tokens produced within the 13 or more category.

The comparison between more recent arrivals and those who were born or have been in the US for many years offers some insight. Men in the 6–12 group are less conservative when it comes to maintenance when compared to the 13 and more group. Years in the US doesn’t strongly affect maintenance, rather it has more of an impact on the degree of lateralization and deletion with more recent arrivals deleting final /ɾ/ at higher rates.

Table 5.15 shows that for women, the differences between the groups are most pronounced in terms of maintenance and lateralization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Male)</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2=226.499; p=<.001\)
Table 5.14 Years in the US crossed with variant of /ɾ/ crossed with gender (male)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Female)</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2=105.572; p=<.001\)
Table 5.15 Years in the US crossed with variant of /ɾ/ crossed with gender (female)
More recent arrivals maintain the /ɾ/ at 63.6% compared to the 13 or more group at 53.3%. The latter group lateralizes final /ɾ/ much more than the 6–12 group: 31.3% vs 15.1%. Both groups elide final /ɾ/ at similar rates: the 6–12 group at 21.2% and the 13 or more group at 15.1%.

Compared to men, women are still more conservative in their speech. However, the longer one has been in the US, the higher the rate of lateralization.

5.3.7 Conclusion

The social factors examined in section 5.3 demonstrate the role they play in sociolinguistic variation. Gender is a key factor in the analysis of New York Dominican Spanish, which subsequently interacts with other social factors. Birthplace along with gender show opposite trends within gender groups: US-born men are more conservative while US-born women are less conservative than their Dominican-born counterparts. We see that for region of origin speakers from Santo Domingo lateralized more than speakers from El Cibao, confirming maintenance of reference lect features in the contact lect. The patterns of lateralization are further demonstrated when gender is considered.

A participant’s age at the time of the interview corresponded to the degree of maintenance of final /ɾ/. Older male participants were less conservative, while the same was true for younger female participants. The 18–25 group, the middle one, maintain final /ɾ/ the most in both groups. In terms of generation in the US, the data show a reflection of overall trends: preference for maintenance followed by lateralization and deletion. By considering gender, the data reveal that men and women are behaving differently in addition to general generational differences. We see that generation 1.5, those who arrived between the ages 6–12, is the most conservative in both groups.
The fewer years male participants spent residing in the US, the less conservative they are in their pronunciation of final /ɾ/. Additionally, there are marked differences in the rates of lateralization and deletion among men. Those who are more established lateralize more than more recent arrivals. The latter group elides final /ɾ/ more than the former. Women, on the other hand, maintain the /ɾ/ at almost equal rates, regardless of time spent living in the US. Female participants who have been here longer tend to lateralize at a higher rate than more recent arrivals. This section discussed social factors in detail. The next section will examine linguistic factors and their relationship to final /ɾ/ variation.

5.4 Linguistic Factors

Studies on Dominican Spanish have long looked at sociolinguistic variation of final /s/ and /ɾ/50. Research on final /s/ reveals an increased rate of deletion when compared to other dialects (Alba 2004; Lipski 2011). Higher rates of aspiration and deletion of final /s/ are affected by a combination of social and linguistic factors. Research on final /ɾ/ also focuses on sociolinguistic variation that is conditioned not only by social and linguistic factors, but also by the dialect zone a speaker comes from. Alba’s 1990 study on Spanish in Santiago, Dominican Republic serves as the basis for this section of the dissertation. Alba looked at a variety of social factors like gender and class, while also taking into account linguistic factors such as word type and syllable stress among others. While he argued that variants of /ɾ/ represent various processed of weakening, this dissertation will focus more on describing the New York Dominican Spanish in its current state (Alba 1990: 65). While I would not rule out the possibility of lenition and fortition in the phonological processes involved in variation, the goal here is to determine to what degree contact varieties are similar to their reference lects by taking into consideration the

50 See section 2.3
following factors: type of word, environment of the syllable, following feature (segment), and syllable stress.

### 5.4.1 Type of Word

Sociolinguistic research on final /s/ variation has long considered the factor type of word. It was hypothesized and later disproven that when the morpheme indicates grammatical category or function (Functional Compensation), it would be less likely to undergo change (Hernández-Campoy and Trudgill 2020). With regard to final /ɾ/, one could argue that deletion would be less likely to occur in infinitives given the function final /ɾ/ serves to indicate grammatical category. The data in this section show that variation of final /ɾ/, especially when it comes to maintenance and deletion in the infinitive category, cannot be simply attributed to function of the morpheme.

Table 5.16 presents final /ɾ/ variation based on the following categories of words: noun, adjective, conjugated verb, infinitive, and other\(^{51}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of word</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugated verb</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{51}\) Words in the “other” category contain prepositions, conjunctions, and articles. Of particular relevance to final /ɾ/, the “other” category is mainly compromised of the conjunction *porque* and the preposition *por*.

(X\(^2\)=1132.848; p=<.001)

Table 5.16 Type of word crossed with variant of /ɾ/
In terms of maintenance, with either the tap or trill variants, the data show that in all categories except for the conjugated verb, the rhotic is produced at 40% or more: noun 42.2%, adjective 46.4%, infinitive 45%, adverb 40%, and the “other” category at 40.2%. Participants maintain the /ɾ/ in the conjugated verb category maintains the /ɾ/ at 32% while preferring the lateral at 64.9%. The lateral also competes with rhotic forms with nouns (51.8%), adjectives (47.6%), and adverbs (56%). For infinitives and those words in the “other” category, deletion is also a frequent variant of final /ɾ/. In the infinitive category, final /ɾ/ is lateralized at rate of 18.7% and elided 33.9% of the time. For the “other” category, participants lateralize the /ɾ/ at 26.4% and delete it at 31.2%.

Like Alba (1990), my data show a high level of deletion of final /ɾ/ despite the meaning the morpheme carries for infinitives. Words in the “other” category share similarities with infinitives, particularly in terms of deletion (31.2%) and lateralization (26.4%).

Given the increased rate of deletion in the infinitive and “other” categories, along with higher rates of deletion among male participants described in the previous section, I added gender as a variable to this analysis. The data show that linguistic and social categories both play a role in the sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/. I especially want to draw attention to variation with infinitives. They are the most frequent word type in the data set, 849 out of 1800 tokens for male participants and 1433 out of 3371 tokens for female participants. Table 5.17 below shows that among men, maintenance was least favored with a combined total of 18.2% compared to lateralization at 25.7% and deletion at 49.8%.
We see in Table 5.18 that women were more conservative than men in their speech. Despite this, women still showed variation across all types of words.

In terms of infinitives, women prefer maintenance at 60.8% with lateralized variants appearing 14.6% of the time and deletion occurring 24.5%. The “other” category offers a different picture. Men deleted final /ɾ/ at 40.6% in the “other” category compared with women at 27%. In this
category women prefer to maintain the rhotic variants (27% for the tap and 23.2% for the trill) at 50.2%, while men only do so at 28.2%. I am focusing on these two types of words because they are the only ones that have the null variant at a significant rate. I would argue that men and women differentiate themselves not only in terms of the variants they use, but also that that differentiation plays itself out across different word types. For women, the noun, adjective, conjugated verb, and adverb categories reflect gender differences mainly between what kind of rhotic is maintained and lateralization of final /ɾ/. For men, it is lateralization that is the preferred variant in the aforementioned categories of words with the elided variant coming into play in the infinitive and “other” category. I would not characterize final /ɾ/ deletion with infinitives and words like porque in “other” category as the result of the same phenomena. Final /ɾ/ in porque is pronounced as [poke] in rapid speech. I would argue however that final /ɾ/ deletion in infinitives carries social and stylistic connotations of informality and street speech.

5.4.2 Environment of the syllable

The environment of the syllable, whether the variant of /ɾ/ is located word internal (recordamos) vs. word final (recordar), was considered one of the key linguistic factors in Alba’s (1990) study. He hypothesized that word internal /ɾ/ would favor maintenance over word final /ɾ/. While his study focuses on the Cibao dialect in Santiago de los Caballeros and this dissertation is looking at dialectal contact between Dominican dialects in New York, comparisons can still be drawn from both data sets. Alba (1990) describes maintenance occurring more in word internal position (63%).

We see in Table 5.19 that the opposite is true in this data set.
Environment of the syllable crossed with variant of /ɾ/ (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment of the syllable</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word final</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word internal</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X^2=709.573; p=<.001)

Table 5.19 Environment of the syllable crossed with variant of /ɾ/

In word internal position, participants maintained the /ɾ/ as either a tap (13.6%) or a trill (23.1%) with a combined percentage of 36.7%. Deletion is also occurring at 18%, most likely due to words like *porque* where the /ɾ/ is deleted in rapid speech. Word final /ɾ/ is maintained as at 48.9%: tap 40.1% and trill 8.8%. Final /ɾ/ located at the end of a word is lateralized at 22.3% and deleted at 26.3%. Based on the data one can infer the interplay of other linguistic factors with the environment of the syllable. Deletion in word-final position suggests that infinitives are playing a role in variation. We will see in the following section how analyzing the factor “following feature” further enhances our understanding of final /ɾ/ variation.

### 5.4.3 Following Feature

By looking at the type of sound that follows /ɾ/, we can get a better understanding of the ways in which manner of articulation is conditioning the pronunciation of the final liquid. The participants in Alba’s (1990) study showed a preference for maintenance when followed by a fricative. The presence of nasals and stops increased rates of deletion and vocalization (1990: 169). The lateral occurred almost exclusively when followed by a lateral, most likely a result of assimilation. The data in Table 5.20 show a different set of variables are at play.
Following feature | Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%) | Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X²=1036.814; p=<.001)

Table 5.20 Following feature crossed with variant of /ɾ/

Maintenance of final /ɾ/ is the preference in most categories: the nasal (45%), the fricative (49.5%), vowel (63.2%) and pause (45.4%). We see that for the vowel category, the preference for the tap (61.7%) stands out when compared to other groups. It is not surprising though given syllabification rules in Spanish. This would suggest that phonological constraints are most active when /ɾ/ is followed by a vowel. Within the rhotic categories, the trill occurs slightly more when followed by nasals at 24.5% compared to 20.5% for the tap. The lateral is common across many types of following features in the data set. It occurs the most when followed by a stop at 42% and by another lateral at 40.6%. While it does occur frequently in other categories as well, nasal 35.2%, fricative 32.8%, and a pause at 26.4%, is rarely produced when followed by a vowel at only 7.5%. Deletion is also common across various manners of articulation. It is least favored when /ɾ/ is followed by a nasal (16.6%) and a fricative at 13.8%. Compare that to the “other” categories where deletion occurs at 20%.

---

52 When /ɾ/ is followed by a vowel, it is usually pronounced as a tap [ɾ]: *caminar* al→ [ka-mi-na-‘[ɾ] al] (Schwegler, Kempff, and Ameal-Guerra, 2010: 284).
5.4.4 Syllable Stress

This section looks at the relationship between syllable stress (tonic vs. atonic) and variation of final /ɾ/. Alba (1990: 173) found that the trill variant is preferred in tonic syllables. The pattern emerging from my data reflects general trends, with preference for maintenance, followed by lateralization and deletion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Stress</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /ɾ/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonic</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atonic</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(\(X^2=217.350; p<.001\))

Table 5.21 Syllable stress crossed with variant of /ɾ/

We see in Table 5.21 that in tonic syllables the tap (24.8%) and trill (14.6%) variants are preferred overall with a combined total of 39.4%. Speakers then lateralize (30.2%) or delete (27.6%) final /ɾ/ the rest of the time. Compare this to the atonic syllable where deletion only occurs at 9.2%. Maintenance occurs more than in unstressed syllables than stressed ones. Participants produce the tap 31.8% and the trill 19.1% at a combined 50.9%. Atonic syllables also show a slightly higher rate of lateralization at 37.4%.

5.4.5 Conclusion

The linguistic factors under consideration broaden our understanding of sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/ in New York Dominican Spanish. We find that word type, environment of the syllable, following feature, and syllable stress all play a role in the variation of final /ɾ/. For the factor word type, we find that infinitives and words from the other category diverge the most with higher percentages of deletion as opposed to maintenance and lateralization. In terms of environment of the syllable, the data show that when final /ɾ/ is located at the end of the word,
the speaker prefers to maintain the /ɾ/ with either a tap or trill variant. When the syllable containing -/ɾ/ is internal, participants prefer lateralization. The results from analyzing the following feature show significant variation. We see that some variants of final /ɾ/ are more subject to phonological constraints than others, such as /ɾ/ followed by a vowel or a pause. I want to clarify that in this case I am referring to pressures from syllabification rules in Spanish, not those for /ɾ/ lateralization as a result of assimilation. In addition to the aforementioned variables, syllable stress also affects variation. Final /ɾ/ is more likely to be maintained in unstressed syllables. In stressed syllables there is an increased chance that /ɾ/ will be deleted, most likely due to the abundance of infinitives in the data.

5.5 Final /l/

Research on Dominican Spanish attests to the vocalization and deletion of final /l/ in the dialect of the Cibao region. This section has two goals. The first is to see whether the vocalized and null variants are used by Cibao speakers in New York. The second is to determine what the existence or absence of said features means for dialectal contact in New York.

Alba (1990) found that final /l/ was relatively stable in Santiago, a region in El Cibao. Vocalizations occurred at 16% and deletion at 13%. He notes that participants who belonged to a lower social class vocalized and deleted more than those who belonged to the middle and upper classes. The data from this dissertation show that participants overwhelmingly prefer maintenance with the lateral representing 98.1% of 2599 tokens as seen below in Table 5.22.

---

53 See section 2.3.1
54 See section 2.3.3
The table below shows the overall results for variants of /l/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of /l/</th>
<th>Frequency (Tokens)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tap</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trill</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocalized</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deletion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retroflex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.22 Overall results for variants of /l/

All other variants, even those associated with El Cibao, did not pass one percent of all realizations. Deletion occurred rarely, with most tokens being produced by two participants.

(6) “Lo vende en la capita[Ø]”
W13NYC18

Vocalization of final /l/ in this case is only produced by one speaker.

(7) “Tengo que organizar a[i]go”.
M2NYC19

Given the stability of final /l/ in New York Dominican Spanish, I limited myself to only running a crosstabulation with region of origin to see if there is variation with regards to dialect zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin in DR</th>
<th>Distribution of variant of /l/ (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>trill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo Region</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibao Region</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2=48.629; \ p<.001\)

Table 5.23 Region of Origin in DR crossed with variant of /l/

The results show that vocalization occurs exclusively with speakers from El Cibao at 2.1%.

Deletion is also rare in the data at 1.1%.
The lack of the realization of final /l/ as vocalization or deletion in the data set raises a series of questions about the existence of said variants in the reference lect. First, what assumptions are being made about the Cibao reference lect? Is the assumption that all speakers of Cibao dialects have been exposed to vocalization and deletion? Would the next assumption be that those who have been exposed to those variants, then acquired and ultimately use them in their speech? If we are to assume that vocalization and deletion are indeed a part of certain speakers’ sociolinguistic repertoire, we can then argue that the semi-formal context in which the data were collected was not conducive to the appearance of non-standard variants.

In the case of participant M2NYC19 who vocalizes the most both with final /ɾ/ and /l/, I would argue that vocalization carries a certain degree of covert prestige in the communities to which he belongs. We know that language use and its associated social meanings depend on the specific sociolinguistic context, Fuller (2013) argues that “if a [language] variety has covert prestige, speakers will continue to speak it because it plays a crucial role in constructing their in-group identities (54)”. In the case of Santiago Spanish, Alba (1990) found that men were more likely to vocalize final /ɾ/ and /l/. The data in this chapter are consistent with the idea that men are less conservative than women. This can be attributed to different social and linguistic pressures. Participant M2NYC18 may experience less pressure, and thus may be more able to vocalize without reproach from his communities. What makes the New York City environment unique is the convergence of, at times, contradictory forces. The first is a dialectal hierarchy with the variety of the Santo Domingo region at the top due to it being the cultural center of the Dominican Republic. The status of the city is ascribed to its dialect while more rural dialects carry less prestigious associations. The second is the tension between in-group pressures of sounding authentically Dominican (final /s/ reduction) and out-group pressures, should they
come under it, to speak a more phonetically normative version of Spanish. Despite the stigma, the case of vocalization as a unique characteristic not only of Dominican Spanish, but also as a regional marker enables the variant to be used as a tool to express Dominican and regional identity.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter described sociolinguistic variation of final /ɾ/ and /l/. In terms of final /ɾ/, the data show that variation is dependent upon a number of social and linguistic factors. Within social variables, I focused on gender not only due to its role as described in previous sociolinguistic research, but also as a factor that demonstrates a high level of covariation with other social variables in the data set. The linguistic factors analyzed in this chapter also show that final /ɾ/ pronunciation varies depending on the type of word, the environment of the syllable, the following feature, and syllable stress. In the case of final /l/, the data show a high degree of stability among Dominicans in New York. The differences in pronunciation occur along the lines of regional origin with speakers from El Cibao producing vocalization, a feature that has been found in the reference lect. Despite low rates of final /l/ vocalization, this feature and speakers from El Cibao in New York warrant further investigation especially given the participants’ awareness of said feature as a unique characteristic of Dominican Spanish\(^{55}\).

\(^{55}\) See section 4.2
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This dissertation provided an analysis of the sociolinguistic variation of final /l/ and /ɾ/ in the Spanish of Dominicans in the New York Metropolitan Area. It offered insights on language attitudes and ideologies held by members of the Dominican community about Dominican and non-Dominican varieties of Spanish. Below I reintroduce the research questions that framed this study.

1) What are the participants’ attitudes toward Dominican and non-Dominican varieties of Spanish? How do these attitudes influence their opinions on language maintenance in the United States?

2) What social variables affect the pronunciation of final /l/ and /ɾ/ in New York Dominican Spanish?

3) What linguistic variables affect the pronunciation of final /l/ and /ɾ/ in New York Dominican Spanish?

The questions consider the sociolinguistic variation that occurs in the New York Metropolitan Area, while also keeping in mind the unique sociolinguistic context where three points of language and dialectal contact converge. Generally, we found that final /ɾ/ is susceptible to a wide range of variation based on social and linguistic factors. When analyzed for gender, we saw women preferred to maintain final /ɾ/, while men favored lateralization. The findings of the dissertation show that final /l/ among Dominicans in New York is stable with maintenance occurring at 98%. Dialectal features like vocalization and deletion of final /l/ were rare even among speakers from El Cibao.

---

56 Dominican Spanish varieties (Santo Domingo and El Cibao), Dominican and non-Dominican Spanish varieties, Dominican Spanish and English.
The answers to the first research question are found in the qualitative analysis described in Chapter 4. Dominicans demonstrate a wide range of attitudes towards Dominican and non-Dominican varieties of Spanish. In terms of their own dialects, participants in the study are aware of a range of lexical, syntactic, phonetic, and discursive features of Dominican Spanish. Most relevant to this dissertation is participants’ knowledge of how social and regional differences manifest themselves in Dominican Spanish, through the pronunciation of final /s/ and final liquids respectively.

Dominicans’ attitudes towards their own dialects vary. Some participants indicated a pride in speaking Dominican Spanish, with some saying that the “best” Spanish comes from the Santo Domingo/La Capital region. Others offered some negative assessments of Dominican Spanish. However, participants rarely expressed negative attitudes towards Dominican Spanish in general terms. These assessments were either directly aimed at Spanish from El Cibao or couched in terms that refer to social status or origin such as “el campo” or “la calle”, with the former being associated with the Cibao region. Participants also expressed a preference for an educated style of Spanish without specifying a regional dialect.

When asked to evaluate other varieties of Spanish in terms of the “best” and “worst” varieties, participants produced responses that reflect the confluence of various language ideologies in the New York Metropolitan Area. One such example is that despite the role of Spanish as a tool for participation in the community, contradictory ideologies still surface in the attitudes expressed by participants regarding Dominican Spanish’s prestige and perceived purity. Some participants indicated Spain and South America, particularly Colombia, as having the “best” Spanish. These results are not surprising given the prestige ascribed to Colombian and Peninsular varieties of Spanish in Latin America. I would argue that when participants refer to
Spanish spoken by Colombians and Spaniards, they are actually referring to the varieties spoken in their capital cities, Bogotá and Madrid. Given the status of capital cities as engines of culture and finance, prestige is usually ascribed to speakers of those dialects\textsuperscript{57}.

In terms of the “worst” Spanish, participants offered negative assessments of varieties spoken in the United States and Puerto Rico. Negative attitudes towards varieties in the United States reveal language ideologies that are related to language maintenance and linguistic purity. Both US and Puerto Rican varieties have been associated with incursions from English, which in turn diminishes the integrity of the varieties in question. Additionally, the supplanting of Spanish with English, be it in one generation or across generations through language shift, goes against the idea in the Dominican community of Spanish being essential for participation in and expression of Dominican identity. Further research on Dominicans in New York City would benefit from a more detailed exploration of the power dynamic shifts where Dominicans are the majority group in the city and Puerto Ricans are no longer the dominant cultural, ethnic, racial, linguistic group.

Additional data from the questionnaire revealed Dominicans mostly interacted with other Dominicans. Whether they interacted with Mainlanders and Caribbean speakers became especially relevant when trying to determine if positive or negative attitudes towards a specific variety corresponded to direct interactions with speakers of said variety. In the case of Colombian Spanish, participants had little to no contact with Colombians. That did not impede them from offering a positive assessment of the Colombian dialect. While I did not measure interactions with Spaniards, I would also argue that participants have little to no contact with Spaniards given the limited presence of that group in the Bronx and Manhattan.

\textsuperscript{57} See Section 4.3
With respect to contact with US and Puerto Rican varieties, it can be taken as a given due to the demographics of the New York Metropolitan Area. When looking at language attitudes, one would want to find a correlation between degree of contact with a group and the assessment of the Spanish of said group. For both the positive and negative attitudes expressed by the participants, I would argue they have been formed by interpersonal experiences and language ideologies that have evolved due to the complex history and status of Dominicans and their varieties of Spanish in the United States and Latin America. Recalling Alfaraz’s (2018) investigation of language attitudes of Cubans in both the United States and Cuba and the differences that emerged between them, I would argue that Dominicans’ attitudes in the US are also likely to be influenced by being a minority population in the United States, but a majority Spanish-speaking population in their own regions, Miami and New York City respectively. Further research would need to be done on Dominicans’ language attitudes towards non-Dominican varieties of Spanish outside of the New York Metropolitan Area to determine the degree to which certain attitudes stem from local interactions or from other ideological sources.

One of the limitations of the questionnaire is that it did not specify the language used in out-group interactions. This makes it difficult to determine whether these interactions were in English or Spanish. With respect to Puerto Ricans, the language of the interactions with Dominicans would impact the formation of certain attitudes. For example, if the perception is that more English is used by Puerto Ricans that could have more of an effect on attitudes towards language maintenance, use, and identity. If interactions were in Spanish and the speakers produced contact phenomena, then attitudes could be formed that deal with linguistic purity of contact vs. non-contact varieties. Nevertheless, the data reveal that the attitudes of participants reflect language ideologies both originating within and outside of the United States.
The answers to the second research question lie in data described in Chapter 5. Each social factor represented a different aspect of a participant’s experience in the United States. As mentioned before, with regard to social factors, maintenance of final /ɾ/ is favored followed by lateralization and deletion. As I discussed in Chapter 5, gender as a variable showed that men and women do differentiate themselves. However, the differences in gender do not mean that women avoid non-standard variants and that men avoid standard ones. The data show that men and women operate within a similar set of linguistic variants but with different rates of occurrence.

As stated earlier in this chapter, women favored the tap or trill, then lateralization, and finally deletion. Men favored lateralization, then deletion, and finally maintenance of final /ɾ/. Other social variables analyzed individually mostly reflect overall trends in pronunciation. With the addition of gender to other social factors, differences within the gender groups became clearer. The factor birthplace, for example, shows that men in the US maintain final /ɾ/ more than those born in the Dominican Republic. The opposite is true for female participants. Regarding age at the time of interview, older men were less conservative than younger ones. For women, we see the trend moving in the opposite direction with younger women being less conservative than those of an older generation. In terms of how age at arrival interacts with gender, the middle group, generation 1.5, maintains final /ɾ/ the most. When it comes to how long a participant has lived in the US, the data show that men and women who have resided in the US longer tend to lateralize more than their more recent counterparts. Within gender groups, years in the US affected the degree of maintenance more noticeably among women and the degree of deletion among men. While the data reveal a high degree of covariation between gender and other social
variables, social variables related to sociolinguistic generation present their own set of problems, which stem from the transnational nature of the New York Dominican community.

When we compare the results to the findings of research on other varieties of Caribbean Spanish in the United States, we see similar trends, but with some key differences. Alfaraz (2007, 2012), Lamboy (2004) show that gender plays a role in variation with men favoring neutralization of final /ɾ/ more than women. This trend is confirmed in the sociolinguistic literature and the results of this dissertation. Alfaraz (2007, 2012) and Lamboy (2004) also show increased levels of neutralization among younger arrivals to the United States and those who belong to generations 2 and 3. The results of this dissertation confirm those trends to an extent. The behavior of participants from generation of 1.5 along with the variable gender would challenge the claims of younger and newer arrivals being less inclined to final /ɾ/. Further research on Dominican Spanish would benefit from a more representative sample not only of generations in the United States, but of age groups and region of origin. Differences in final liquid production may actually be changes that are already occurring in the Dominican Republic that are not solely a result of, but rather part of processes that are accelerated by dialectal contact in the United States.

Research on Puerto Ricans in the United States can also offer insight into the effect a community, both in terms of size and integration, have on final liquid variation. Valentín-Márquez (2020) suggests that a higher degree community integration in the Puerto Rican community in Grand Rapids, Michigan increases the chances of lateralization. Ramos-Pellicia (2020) adds that community size also matters with larger communities being more likely to maintain features of the reference lect. While it is possible to make a comparison between Puerto

---

58 See section 5.3.1
Rican and Dominican communities in terms of the pronunciation of final /ɾ/, I would be cautious because of the social meanings attached to lateralization in each community. Valentín-Márquez (2015) mentions the stigmatization lateralization carries in the Puerto Rican community because of an erroneous belief among some in Latin America that lateralization in Puerto Rican Spanish goes beyond final positions (342–343). While Dominican participants did indicate lateralization as a feature of their dialect, it does not carry the same linguistic and ideological baggage as it does among Puerto Ricans.

Lastly, ideas of community integration and community size among Dominicans in New York City are difficult to compare with the Puerto Rican communities described in Valentín-Marquez (2020) and Ramos-Pellicia (2020). The sheer size and transnational nature of the Dominican community would suggest a high degree of integration overall. Additionally, a higher degree of integration would support a more stable sociolinguistic environment for language maintenance and transmission across the generations. Some parallels could be drawn between Dominicans in New York City and Cubans in Miami seeing the size and history of both groups in those metropolitan areas. Future studies on Dominican Spanish in New York would need to consider the Spanish of the third and fourth generations with an eye on what sociolinguistic factors (community size, interaction with newcomers, transnationalism, dialectal contact with non-Dominican varieties of Spanish, etc.) contribute to successful language maintenance and transmission.

Birthplace, years in the US, and age at arrival are unstable variables for a certain set of the participants. Take for example one participant who was born in New York, but who then left for Dominican Republic at the age of five. He then returned to the US at age 13 and resided in New York for 10 years. This raises questions about what his first language was. If he was raised by
Spanish-speaking parents we can assume his first language was Spanish, despite the likelihood of having entered preschool programs between the ages of 3–5. Additionally, leaving the US at a young age and returning at the age of 13 means he received most of his education in the Dominican Republic. I categorized this participant as generation 1.5, but arguments could be made that he is in fact generation 1. The back-and-forth nature of certain participants’ time in the US is not an anomaly. Other participants also reported times when they were moving between countries. These interruptions in a person’s time in the US do not fit neatly into categories of social variables. While these variables are important, future studies must consider that the Dominican community’s migration patterns are more fluid than these variables allow. Lastly, the more conservative behavior of generation 1.5 when compared to generations 1 and 2 is fertile ground for future investigations. The fact that generation 1.5 distinguishes itself in this way points to differences in how this group was raised, the identities they hold, the social pressures they feel, and being a part of both American and Dominican cultures in ways that are distinct from the experiences of generations 1 and 2.

The factor region of origin did show relevance for sociolinguistic variation. Participants from El Cibao maintained final /ɾ/ slightly less than speakers from Alba’s (1990) study: 49% vs 56%. Deletion showed a small similarity with participants from El Cibao eliding final /ɾ/ at 20.1% compared to Alba’s (1990) data which showed deletion occurring at 28%. The biggest difference is seen with lateralization with my participants producing the lateralized variant at 23.4% compared to speakers from Alba’s (1990) study who lateralized at 5%. While participants in both studies come from the same dialect zone, it is difficult to draw comparisons because of a) vocalization of final liquids is in decline in younger age groups in El Cibao (Reyes 2020: 123), b) the lateralization produced by participants from El Cibao, and c) semi-formal context in which
data were gathered. Future studies would benefit from focusing specifically on multigenerational speakers from El Cibao. Lateralization is not exclusive to Santo Domingo while vocalization of /l/ and /ɾ/ and deletion of final /l/ is more directly associated with El Cibao. Do we attribute increased lateralization to phonological changes in El Cibao? Is it the expansion of said feature beyond the region in the Dominican Republic? Is the Dominican dialectal context similar to what Alfaraz (2007) describes where male speakers from Central Cuba benefit from covert prestige by producing features like consonant assimilation that are strongly associated with the Havana dialect59? Is there a dialectal leveling in New York? Did participants from El Cibao born in the US never acquire the stigmatized feature in the first place? It is most likely a combination of all the above. The dialects of the parents, particularly for those born and/or raised in the United States, is also worth studying. Potowski (2008) argues that Spanish speakers in the US in a multidialectal family exhibit phonetic and lexical characteristics of the mother’s dialect more frequently than those of the father’s. Considering the parents’ dialects would further enrich multigenerational and multidialectal studies of Dominicans in New York.

Lastly, the sociolinguistic context of the interview must be kept in mind when interpreting the results of the dissertation. This study, along with the literature, show that vocalization is a stigmatized feature of Dominican Spanish. I would argue the low status of the feature coupled with the majority of the interviews occurring in a formal university setting did not encourage the realization of said feature. It was rarer for the interview to occur in someone’s home. It is also important to note that as the person who conducted the interviews, I am an out-group member of Puerto Rican descent. While these circumstances were not a hindrance, I would not rule out the possibility that these dynamics may have affected the appearance of the most stigmatized

59 See section 2.8.
variants. Returning to participant M2NYC18 and his vocalizations, I would argue that for some Dominicans, regional pride and a sense of Dominicaness may override feelings of social stigma. I again repeat my call for more research on speakers from El Cibao to further consider questions of regional pride and identity.

In response to question three, the data from Chapter 5 show how variation is conditioned by several linguistic factors. For type of word, we saw that participants maintained final /ɾ/ or lateralized. Other variants were more frequent when it came to certain word types like infinitives, which made up the majority of the words in the data set, and words from the “other” category like porque. For infinitives we saw an increase in maintenance among women. Men had a much higher rate of lateralization and deletion. The rate of maintenance overall of final /ɾ/ in infinitives is similar to what Alba found in his research: 45% vs 47% respectively (1990: 186). Lateralization was less frequent in my data at 18.7%, while rare in Alba’s at 5% (1990: 186). It would be beneficial in future studies to analyze infinitives and the word porque separately in order to address a) the effect of frequency on variation of final /ɾ/, b) the fact that variation in both words is influenced by different phonological process (word internal vs. word final, following feature), and c) the social meanings behind variation of final /ɾ/ in infinitives are different to the variation in the conjunction porque.

Type of word was also explored in Ramos-Pellicia (2020) among Puerto Ricans in the US. She found a strong preference in the Hazlet, NJ community for lateralization in infinitives at 97.1% and conjugated verbs at 92.3%. Decreasing levels of lateralization occurred with nouns at 82.1% and with the factor group adjectives and adverbs at 68.4% (Ramos-Pellicia 2020: 47). Comparing Ramos-Pellicia’s (2020) results to those of this dissertation indicate a need to engage in more complicated analysis, one that consider linguistic and extralinguistic constraints as
Otheguy and Zentella (2012) when they studied Spanish in New York City. In addition to the consideration of constraints, I argue later in this chapter for future studies to employ more complex forms of statistical analysis than those used in this dissertation to describe the interaction of linguistic and social variables more clearly.

The data show that environment of the syllable is significant with more maintenance occurring in word-internal syllables that word final: 48.9% vs 36.7%. Alba (1990) also found that his participants from el Cibao maintained final /ɾ/ more in word-internal position: 63% vs 51%. Both studies share a 12% difference in favor of maintaining final /ɾ/ in word-internal syllables. Environment of the syllable as a factor is not without its own set of limitations. The very nature of the factor means that final /ɾ/ in word internal position cannot be followed by a vowel. Final /ɾ/ in word final position allows for more possibilities in terms of the sound that can follow. A more sophisticated multivariate analysis should be used in the future to tease apart the relationship between the variables.

For variable “following feature”, there are indications of phonological influence. Overall, when final /ɾ/ is followed by nasals and fricatives variation shows a preference for maintenance, then lateralization and deletion. Final /ɾ/ is maintained at 45% when followed by a nasal. Compare this to 56% among Alba’s (1990) participants. Dominicans in New York maintained final /ɾ/ when followed by a fricative at 49.5% (171). We see in Alba’s (1990) data a much stronger preference for maintenance at 69% (171). With laterals and stops, a pattern of lateralization, then maintenance, and deletion emerges. Alba’s (199) research also shows participants favoring lateralization when followed by a lateral at 44% (171). This is similar to my results where participants from New York produced the lateral at 40.6 in the same context. In terms of stops, Alba’s data shows a higher degree of maintenance than my data (58% vs 32.2%).
with very few occurrences of lateralization in comparison to my sample (4% vs 42%). It is important to keep in mind that the comparisons listed above are between Alba’s (1990) study on a dialect in El Cibao and another is combining data from two dialect zones with different variants of final /ɾ/. Additionally, Alba’s (1990) data shows much higher levels of deletion, vocalization, and aspiration, the last of which is not one of the variables of this dissertation. Lastly, in my data final /ɾ/ followed by a vowel or a pause show the highest increase in maintenance. When followed by a vowel, deletion is then most favored. With a pause, lateralization and deletion occur at similar levels. The variable stress showed that maintenance occurred in unstressed syllables. Deletion was more likely in stressed syllables.

Future studies would be enhanced by employing an acoustic analysis of the variants. This would not only be useful in identifying the variants more accurately, but also in determining what phonetic processes are occurring with regard to the factor “following feature” i.e., assimilation, lenition, fortition. I also mentioned previously that future studies would need to take into account the covariation between the factors. While I ran a series of crosstabulations with social factors to uncover patterns not visible with just one layer of analysis, linguistic variables demonstrated a degree of variation that for the purposes of this dissertation did not require additional layers for the interpretation of the data. That does not mean, however, that it would not be beneficial to run more crosstabulations or to engage in a more sophisticated multivariate analysis. Take for example adding gender to the analysis of type of word and variant of /ɾ/. This two-layer crosstabulation showed that the pattern of variation that initially emerges with factor “type of word”, is further accentuated by adding gender. Given that the dissertation analyzes dialectal variation, one could argue that adding region of origin as an additional layer would reveal linguistic differences. However, the data show that those dialectal differences did
not manifest themselves as sharply as had been anticipated with regard to final liquid pronunciation. Covariation can occur, but we must keep in mind that certain factors are more salient in this particular sociolinguistic environment as opposed to the country of origin. This is especially relevant for this dissertation that is looking at a variety through two prisms. The first looks at similarities between the reference lect and the contact lect. The other looks at New York Dominican Spanish as belonging to a community that includes speakers from all mainland Dominican dialects across multiple generations.

This dissertation is a continuation of studies that explore New York Dominican Spanish, particularly those that look to uncover dynamics that contribute to language maintenance and affect sociolinguistic variation. As more research is being done on Dominican Spanish in the United States, more attention should be paid to Dominicans as speakers of different regional and social varieties of Spanish. The data show there are shared features across many social factors, but regional differences, however slight, still did manifest themselves in the speech of participants. Upon coming to the United States, the sociolinguistic variables that can be applied to Dominican speakers increase because their lives here reflect a different social reality than the one they experienced back in the Dominican Republic. Their experiences in the US are shaped by a combination of economic, social, and immigrational factors. The findings of this dissertation suggest that Dominican communities in New York are dynamic and will continue to interact with different types of speakers with varying levels of proficiency in Spanish and English.

Whether the participants exhibit negative or positive attitudes toward the Dominican dialect, they all indicated that there is value in knowing and speaking Spanish. The findings are of particular relevance to research that looks at the dynamics of out-group and in-group
interactions. Given Dominican cultural dominance among New York’s Spanish speaking residents, it is unlikely that out-group pressures from a non-dominant group would trump the need or desire to participate in the Dominican community using what are considered authentic varieties of Dominican Spanish.

This chapter summarized the findings of this dissertation. Variation of final /ɾ/ is subject to a multiplicity of social and linguistic factors. Final /l/ showed a high level of stability with limited dialectal variation. The New York Dominican community represents various social groups and, as such, they hold ideologies that reflect linguistic hierarchies in Latin America, Spain, and the United States. Future sociolinguistic studies on New York Dominican Spanish should take into consideration the high degree of ethnolinguistic vitality and the transnational nature of the Dominican community. Keeping this in mind, linguists can examine how the aforementioned factors are reflected not only in dialectal phonetic differences, but also in linguistic attitudes and ideologies that shape the Spanish-speaking Dominican community in the New York Metropolitan Area. Additionally, more detailed acoustic and multivariate analyses will further illuminate the phonetic and social processes at play in the pronunciation of final /l/ and /ɾ/ in New York Dominican Spanish.
APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

Cuestionario
#_______
Fecha____________________________________________________
Lugar de la entrevista_____________________________________

A. Lugar de nacimiento: Elija uno, por favor
   a. República Dominicana____
Pueblo/ciudad de origen____________________________________
   b. Estados Unidos____
Condado/ciudad de origen____
Pueblo/ciudad de origen de sus familiares en la República
Dominicana______________________________________________

B.
Sexo____________________________________________________

C.
Edad____________________________________________________

D.
Edad a la que llegó a los EEUU__________________________

E.
Años en los EEUU_______________________________________

F.
Clase social a la que Ud. pertenece
   Alta________
   Media_______
   Obrera_______

G.
   a. Profesión del informante en los EEUU________________________
      (Si es estudiante, profesión del padre y madre en los EEUU)
                                                                __________
   b. Profesión del informante en el país de origen
c. Profesión del padre en el país de origen

H.
¿Dónde se educó? ________________________________________________
Años completados ________________________________________________

I.
a. ¿Habla inglés? Sí ______ No ______
   Excelente ______
   Muy bien ______
   Pasable/Aceptable ______
   Pobre ______
b. ¿Sabe leer y escribir en inglés?
   Leer ______
   Escribir ______

J.
a. ¿Habla español? Sí ______ No ______
   Excelente ______
   Muy bien ______
   Pasable/Aceptable ______
   Pobre ______
b. ¿Sabe leer y escribir en español?
   Leer ______
   Escribir ______

K.
a. ¿Qué idioma aprendió primero?
   inglés ______
   español ______
   ambos ______
b. ¿A que edad aprendió el otro idioma? ______
c. ¿Cómo y dónde lo aprendió?
d. ¿Qué idioma habla mejor?
inglés ______
español ______

e. ¿Cuál le gusta más?
inglés ______
español ______

L.
Ponga I, E o A en los espacios correspondientes
I= inglés
E=español
A=ambos

¿Cuál idioma(s) habla con su(s):
_____Papá
_____Mamá
_____hermanos/as
_____hijos menores
_____hijos mayores
_____amigos
_____jefe
_____compañeros de trabajo
_____compañeros de escuela
_____esposo/a o novio/novia

M.
Ponga P, M, o N en los espacios correspondientes a la cantidad de español que use el informante en las distintas actividades:
P=poco español
M=mucho español
¿Cuánto español usa Ud. en:

- casa
- la escuela
- el trabajo
- actividades sociales
- al leer
- al escuchar la radio
- al mirar la televisión

Por favor, ponga P, M, o N solamente cuando el informante de hecho participa en las siguientes actividades. Si alguna(s) de las actividades no son pertinentes al informante (no escucha la radio, no asiste a la escuela) no se debe poner ni P ni M ni N, sino se debe poner NA = no aplicable.

Use las tres primeras columnas, Mucho, Algo, Poco.

Si el informante ofrece información suplementaria, escribala en una o dos palabras bajo la columna de Dónde.

¿Cuánto contacto tiene Ud. con los siguientes grupos, y dónde [en la casa, el trabajo, el vecindario]?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grupo</th>
<th>Mucho</th>
<th>Algo</th>
<th>Poco</th>
<th>Dónde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuatorianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicanos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubanos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominicanos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puertorriqueños</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O. Conteste las siguientes preguntas, por favor, en el espacio a continuación

1) ¿Cuáles son algunas características del español dominicano?
2) ¿Dónde se habla el mejor español? ¿El peor?

3) ¿Es importante saber el español? ¿El inglés?
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