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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the interrelationship of language, identity, and /ae/ (“ash”) variation along the first-formant (F1) and second-formant (F2) dimensions, in first- and second- generation Latinos in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. /ae/ was selected since Latino English /ae/ tends to be lower and more backed than in general American English, particularly in pre-nasal context. Methods integrate quantitative analysis of social and stylistic patterning of /ae/ variation and qualitative analysis of how speakers use these features to convey and shape social and personal meanings in interaction. The relationship between style, social factors, and substrate-related phonetic variation in emergent dialects has important implications for language system development and social identity construction in situations of bilingualism and language contact. Specific research questions were 1) how does /ae/, a phonological feature showing a well-documented distinction between Chicano English and general American English varieties, vary in the English of Washington, D.C. Latinos? 2) How does /ae/ variation contribute to stylistic variation and interactional construction of identity in sociolinguistic interviews and other interactional contexts? Quantitative mixed-model statistical regression analysis addressed inter-speaker and topic-related variation in sociolinguistic interviews and self-recorded data. Results showed that low, backed /ae/ is stylistically active among Washington, D.C.-area Latinos.
Changing settlement patterns are also reflected in the data. Suburban participants show a lower realization of /ae/ than residents of D.C. proper (p<0.05), as gentrification and rising housing prices have prompted Latinos to move out of the city. Unraised /ae/ is a feature of native, not learner English, and its presence in multiple Latino Englishes suggests that the linguistic process at work may be similar to that affecting Chicano English /ae/. The contrast between the Latino English and general American English /ae/ patterns appears to be used for identity work that goes beyond a direct ethnic index. Qualitative analysis of interactional positioning (Bamberg 1997) showed that sociophonetic patterning took place in identity-salient stretches of discourse (Podesva, 2007), within and across topic boundaries. Meta-discursive commentary indicated that speakers had a salient sense of ethnic identity and local place related to language practices. Multifaceted methodological and analytic approaches to variation can present a more complete picture of the interrelation between variable linguistic patterning and social meaning. These connections affect language practices across generations, as emergent language varieties become legitimate language systems with important cultural and identity associations.
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This dissertation offers theoretical and methodological contributions to sociolinguistic research on variation, style, identity construction, and social meaning in situations of language contact and immigration. My aim is twofold: to show how social and linguistic factors in contact situations influence feature transfer and the coalescence of new language varieties in immigrant communities, and to contribute to our understanding of identity as a discursively constructed process that is multifaceted rather than monolithic, fluid rather than static, and emergent over time. The study examines the relationship between linguistic form and language as a social practice in first- and second-generation immigrants of Latino origin in Washington, D.C., an understudied minority population with much to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between language, identity, migration, and contact, especially in the current climate of gentrification and social change in the Washington, D.C. area. In particular, the investigation focuses on the low front vowel /æ/, a feature with demonstrated potential for stylistic variation in Chicano English (Eckert, 1996). The feature is examined using a mixed-methods approach that integrates 1) quantitative inter-speaker variation analysis, 2) intra-speaker variation analysis, and 3) qualitative analysis of discourse contexts in which linguistic features of interest occur.

1.1 The Variable: /æ/

This dissertation focuses on variation along the F1 and F2 dimensions, corresponding to vowel height and fronting/backing, in the low-front vowel /æ/, as in the word “ash”. /æ/ has been shown in several studies to have potential significance for identity display in Chicano
English, the most-studied Latino English variety (Eckert, 2008a; Fought, 2003; Roeder, 2010). This potential is due to the contrast between /ae/ patterns associated with general American and Chicano English. The former displays a raising pattern in which /ae/ tenses, raising and fronting before nasal consonants (e.g., “ban”), while the Chicano English variant does not. Lower, backed Chicano English /ae/ realizations may originally have been a consequence of transfer from Spanish, which lacks an equivalent to the English low, front, lax vowel (Gorman & Kester, 2004; MacDonald, 1989). However, Chicano English is a native English variety in which non-standard /ae/ forms part of a structured system, rather than representing Spanish phonological interference in non-native English. The contrast between Chicano English and general American English /ae/ can be exploited for stylistic use (Eckert, 1996, 2008a), for example when Latino speakers use the general American realization when positioning themselves as authoritative (Tseng, 2011). This use may relate to the contrast between marked linguistic varieties and features (Benor, 2010), which are typically associated with minority social groups and variously referred to as “vernaculars”, “ethnolects”, etc., and unmarked, general American varieties associated with the white majority group and often considered to be more “standard” or “correct” (Campbell-Kibler, 2011; Irvine, 2001; Lippi-Green, 1997). Finally, there is some evidence that first formant (F1), the acoustic frequencies in a vowel that correspond with vowel height, and second formant (F2), corresponding with vowel fronting or backing, may operate separately in stylistic use of Chicano English features (Eckert, 1996; Fought, 2003). However, /ae/ variation in newer and more heterogeneous Latino communities such as those in the D.C. area remains largely unexplored, as does the variable’s stylistic potential more broadly.
1.2 Research Questions

This research addresses two questions related to the production and social meaning of the phonological feature /ae/, which was selected due to its contrastive realizations in Chicano and general American English, and its sociolinguistic variation and stylistic potential in Chicano English (e.g., Carter, 2007; Eckert, 1996, 2008a; Roeder, 2006, 2009; Thomas, 2001):

1) How does /ae/, a phonological feature showing a well-documented distinction between Chicano English and general American English varieties, vary in the English of Washington, D.C. Latinos?

2) How does /ae/ variation contribute to stylistic variation and interactional construction of identity in sociolinguistic interviews and other interactional contexts?

These questions address the potential emergence of ethnolectal /ae/ realization in D.C.-area Latinos’ English; the social and linguistic factors that may affect this variation, including stylistic variation; and the sociophonetic identity work which different /ae/ realizations may perform in discourse. Through this study, I hope to provide a deeper understanding of the processes which may affect language systems, linguistic repertoires, and identity construction in situations of language and cultural contact.

1.3 Research Methods

In this dissertation, I draw on both quantitative and qualitative analysis to examine stylistic use of the phonetic variable /ae/ in interaction. My analysis integrates acoustic measurement of the variable, quantitative analysis of its distribution, qualitative analysis of its discursive patterning across different interactional contexts, and meta-discursive insight into speaker attitudes. Quantitative methods examine the effects of independent social and linguistic
factors on /ae/ realization (preceding/following linguistic environment; gender; immigration generation; education level; discourse topic). These analyses apply mixed-model statistical regression analysis to whole-group /ae/ tokens from sociolinguistic interviews, and to individual-speaker /ae/ tokens taken from a subset of interview and self-recorded data.

Vowel tokens were identified through acoustic phonetic analysis using the Forced Alignment and Vowel Extraction (FAVE) suite (Rosenfelder, Fruehwald, Evanini, & Yuan, 2011). To eliminate any possible influence of rhotics, glides, and approximants on vowel formants, tokens preceded by /r/, /w/, or /y/ or followed by /l/ or /r/ were excluded from analysis (Thomas, 2001). F1 and F2 measurements, corresponding to vowel height and backing, respectively, were extracted for each vowel token at the first one-third of duration (Evanini, 2009, pp. 65-66), using linear predictive coding in the FAVE suite. Vowel measurements were normalized in the FAVE suite using the Lobanov (1971) z-transformation method, which allows for meaningful phonetic comparison between speakers.

All statistical analysis was performed using mixed-model regression analysis in the Rbrul suite (Johnson, 2009). This type of statistical analysis is capable of addressing vowels as gradient variables, and individual speakers and words as random effects. Inter-speaker variation analysis was used to investigate the relationship between several independent linguistic and social factors, namely: preceding and following phonetic environment; sex (Roeder, 2010); immigrant generation; age; level of educational attainment; country of origin; city or suburb of residence.

Intra-speaker variation analysis of /ae/ by linguistic environment and topic was then conducted on interview data. The topics used in the analysis emerged from the interview data, and included language, Latino identity, life in D.C., family, etc. Topic identification was
triangulated between myself and two additional coders, with a 4-tier scale of agreement used to calculate inter-rater reliability. This approach is able to account for topics that may be meaningful for some speakers but do not appear in the group as a whole. Significant results for particular topics indicated that the Latino and general American /ae/ variants were meaningful in terms of particular aspects of identity. Self-recorded data was analyzed according to linguistic environment and interactional context (i.e., interview, work, with friends).

I used qualitative analysis to contextualize quantitative findings using qualitative discourse analysis to characterize speakers’ self- and other-positioning via stancework and pronominal choice. Discursive processes such as positioning are important aspects of the interactive construction of identity through language, in line with constructivist understandings of identity as dynamic and created through contrast and interaction, rather than essentialized to static, externally imposed social identifiers (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Du Bois, 2007; Goffman, 1981; Schiffrin, 2002). Qualitative examinations of positioning, stance-work and pronominal choice provide a way of identifying correlations between the “Latino” and “general American” /ae/ variants and speaker identity work. Since stance and positioning acts necessarily relate to speakers’ social values, this combined approach provided insight into the meanings attached to different realizations of the variable. For example, consistent use of the fronted variant while self-positioning as “capable,” supported by metadiscursive commentary contrasting “accented” and “correct” speech, may indicate negative attitudes towards the backed variant and positive associations with the fronted realization (Tseng, 2011). Speaker metadiscourse about language and identity was also used to contextualize /ae/ patterns in terms of speaker attitudes.
1.4 Data and Participants

Data for these analyses consisted of sociolinguistic interviews conducted by me, and interactions self-recorded by participants in a range of contexts, without my presence. Interviews were aimed at eliciting naturalistic speech data about the speakers’ daily lives in D.C. and revealing community attitudes towards language and Latino identity. Interviews were loosely guided by question modules about identity, including immigration, language attitudes and language use, and popular perceptions of Latinos. Since sociolinguistic interviews alone may be inadequate to capture the range of styles, or variation in individuals’ speech (Bell, 1997, p. 240; Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998, p. 214), available in bilingual and bidialectal settings (Sharma, 2011), I supplemented interview data with participant self-recordings. Two interview participants, one male and one female, were willing to record their conversations in a range of settings at home and at work, documenting their language practices in multiple interactional contexts. Due to environmental noise which affected recording quality, I selected one set of self-recordings for analysis in this dissertation.

Speakers were first- and second-generation Latino immigrants ages 18-50 who have lived in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area since age 15 or before. First-generation immigrants are those born outside the United States. In my participant sample, I restricted analysis to a particular subset of first-generation immigrants, namely those who arrived in childhood and before adolescence, known elsewhere as 1.5-generation immigrants (Zhou, 1997, p. 65; the cut-off age for adolescence remains poorly defined in this definition, as in other fields; see Eckert, 2004). This group was selected to control for native English proficiency (Santa Ana, 1993). Second-generation immigrants are defined as being U.S.-born with at least one non-native-born
parent (Fry & Passel, 2009). This population of first- and second-generation immigrants was selected because of its likely exposure to Spanish and/or either second-language English or a non-standard Latino English variety, as well as other native English varieties, and having meaningful social associations with language, identity, and the immigrant experience in Washington, D.C. Since all participants either were born in D.C. or arrived in D.C. as young children or adolescents, this provides a baseline of exposure to D.C.-area dialect(s) and age of onset of English acquisition. Participants were recruited through word-of-mouth in local social networks via initial contacts in community organizations such as community colleges and arts and activism groups.

A total of 12 participants, 6 men and 6 women, were selected based on the residency criteria I have described above. Of these participants, 7 were first-generation and 5 were second-generation immigrants. All speakers were bilingual and reported regularly using both English and Spanish in their daily lives. Bilingual practices were typically domain-related (Fishman, 1972). Overall, Spanish was used in the home and with parents and older relatives; English and Spanish were used with friends and siblings; and English or English and Spanish were used variably in the workplace. All participants currently reside in the urban Washington, D.C. metropolitan area: in the city itself, and in the bordering suburbs of Montgomery County, Maryland, and the Seven Corners area of Northern Virginia. Many of these “outer suburb” residents had previously lived in D.C.’s iconic Latino neighborhoods but moved outside the city due to the increased cost of housing associated with gentrification.
1.5 Research Site

Washington, D.C. offers a productive site to examine the sociolinguistic questions I have articulated above. The city’s rapidly growing Latino population is situated within a multifaceted and changing social geography. D.C. is home to newcomers and transient residents as well as well-established neighborhoods that still reflect the ethnic lines of historic residential segregation. For example, until 2011 D.C. was a famously majority-black city, as celebrated in the iconic 1975 funk song and album “Chocolate City” by Parliament. The loss of this demographic majority in 2011 due to gentrification caused an identity crisis reflected in headlines such as “Is Washington, D.C. no longer the ‘Chocolate City’?” (NewsOne, 2011, September 1) and “Farewell to Chocolate City” (Hopkinson, 2012, June 23, The New York Times Sunday Review). D.C. is also a hyperdiverse immigrant destination, according to Price and Benton-Short’s (2007) definition: “cities of 1 million or more people … [where] (1) at least 9.5% of the total population is foreign-born, (2) no one country of origin accounts for 25% or more of the immigrant stock and (3) immigrants come from all regions of the world” (p. 112). In short, Washington D.C. is a site of much contact between diverse cultures and languages, within a pre-existing social landscape populated by ideologies of race and occupancy. It is thus a rich environment for the study of dialect development in a situation of social and linguistic contact, adaptation, and identity display (Eckert, 2011; see also Hodder, 1982). However, relatively little sociolinguistic research has addressed these specific issues in Washington, D.C. Pioneering studies by Fasold (1972) and Wolfram (1984), as well as recent research from Georgetown University’s project on Language and Communication in Washington, D.C., have documented and compared variable linguistic features of African American and European American residents.
of D.C. and explored their sociocultural and identity implications. These studies share the general finding that social factors such as people’s senses of identity, related to community histories, seem to affect linguistic variation (Grieser, 2014; Nylund, 2013). More research is needed in order to understand these connections, particularly as they impact Latino Washingtonians and other minority groups.

The linguistic and social context of Washingtonian Latinos offers a productive site for research on language and identity, and for comparison with the most-studied Latino English variety, Chicano Englisha. The local population is primarily of Central American descent (rather than Chicanos’ Mexican ancestry), with a particularly high presence of immigrants from El Salvador. Further, the D.C. Latino population is generally more diverse than the Mexican American communities where Chicano English has typically been investigated, encompassing many national origins and a range of social experiences and social classes, from undocumented laborers to World Bank staff and other international organizations. Linguistically, D.C. Latinos may be exposed to a variety of Spanish and English dialects (though local varieties remain understudied), as well as second-language English. Official language statistics indicate that the majority of speakers are likely to be bilingual, speaking English fluently and maintaining Spanish use. According to the 2009 American Communities Study (Johnson et al., 2010), U.S. Salvadorans and Mexicans, who account for the most common nationalities among D.C. Latinos, maintained a high degree of Spanish (92% and 76% speaking Spanish in the home, respectively). Further evidence of bilingualism is found in U.S. Census 2011 findings that 56.3% of U.S.

---

a The other primary bodies of sociolinguistic research on Latino language practices focus on Spanish dialect contact and variation and on Spanish-English code-switching. This research has tended to concentrate on Mexican American communities in the southwestern United States and California, and speakers of Caribbean background in New York City (but see also Newman, 2010, and Slomanson & Newman, 2004).
Latinos spoke English “very well” (Ryan, 2013), and Census 2000 findings that approximately half of D.C. residents who speak Spanish at home also speak English “very well” (Census 2000; Johnson et al., 2010; Ryan, 2013; Saenz, 2010).

Washington, D.C. has seen dramatic growth in the Latino population over the past decades—approximately 600% since 1980—accompanied by a concomitant “contentious” debate about immigration (Singer, 2007). The population which arrived from 1980 on is still present in the original Latino neighborhoods of Adams Morgan, Mount Pleasant, and Columbia Heights, which retain iconic status as ethnic enclaves both for Latinos and within the broader D.C. community. Under gentrification pressure, however, the population is migrating out from these original areas to the bordering Outer Suburbs of Northern Virginia and Maryland, principally Montgomery County and Prince George’s County in Maryland, and Fairfax, Loudon, and Prince William Counties in Virginia.

The continuance of historical patterns of residential segregation and the effects of gentrification can be seen in the population maps below, based on U.S. Census figures from 2000 and 2010. Here, red indicates white American residents at a factor of one dot per 40 residents, blue indicates African-American residents, and orange indicates self-identified Latino residents. The diamond shape indicates the boundaries of the city proper and inner northern Virginia suburbs (for example, Rosslyn). As can be seen, the left-hand side of the map, representing the northwest and southwest quadrants of the city, is dominated by white residents, and the right-hand side, representing the northeast and southeast quadrants, by African American residents. The division coincides roughly with local roads, Rock Creek Parkway and 16th Street, which are
salient to residents as evinced by the comments of one study participant, Emanuel\(^b\), during an interview:

No, white person was, seen on this side. Especially on this area. If you talking about Columbia Heights. You know, Mt. Pleasant, Adams Morgan so, those were like, of that type. … Over here you never saw white people, they were black or Hispanic. No, white people always lived on the other side of 16th Street.

In the 2000 map, Latino residents can be seen in the central city, in Columbia Heights, Adams Morgan, and Mount Pleasant, and along the Virginia and Maryland borders. However, by 2010, Latino residents were nearly absent from the central city neighborhoods, and white residency had shifted heavily to these gentrifying neighborhoods. Black residents had also shifted towards the Maryland suburbs under this pressure.

---

\(^b\) All speakers were given pseudonyms to preserve confidentiality.
Cities are not merely physical spaces but also social places, “spaces of imagination and … [of] representation” (Johnstone, 2010a; see also Bridge & Watson, 2000, p. 7). The changes caused by immigration send a ripple effect through the sociocultural landscape, due to competing bids for space, ownership, and claims of belonging. The contentious effects of Latino immigration on D.C. social geography is attested to by Modan’s (2007) ethnography of the Mount Pleasant neighborhood, in which she notes norms of public social behavior and use of shared space, among other points of contention, as well as by incidents such as the Mount Pleasant riots of 1991 and recent anti-immigrant legislation in neighboring Prince William County. Contested social situations such as these provide fertile ground for linguistic identity performance as different social groups engage with “ideologies and strategies of legitimation” (Eckert, 2011; see also Hodder, 1982). Since we often conceive of language as “naturalized” in particular locales and embodied by particular social figures or personae (Silverstein, 2003, 2011; Agha, 2007; Coupland, 2006), language and the social categories it indexes are often taken to
entail particular types of social behavior. Such ethnolinguistic stereotypes are extensively attested in the literature on accent perception, media stereotypes, and language policy, to name a few key areas. For example, ideologies of fear and “otherness” related to Latinos and their cultural and linguistic practices are widespread in the United States (Fought, 2006; Santa Ana, 2002; Zentella, 1997). Ultimately, these ideologies relate to negotiated concepts of who belongs in a particular community (Anderson, 1983), and in what social roles. D.C. Latinos, like many Chicanos, are exposed to essentializing and often discriminatory ideologies that share broad commonalities on a national level (for example, discourses about “what immigrants are like” and resistance to the Dream Act, legislation providing a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrant youth which has been proposed and defeated in Congress since 2001. These broad ideologies can also manifest and be accepted or resisted in locally specific ways (for example, participants in this study expressed resentment of hegemonic, homogenizing attempts by non-Latinos to characterize them as “Mexican”). Both broad and local levels of ideology potentially inform speech patterns, since speakers draw meaningful associations between language, identity, and the differentiation and integration tensions inherent to immigration.

1.6 Summary

Research on linguistic style, language variation, and identity construction in situations of language and social contact offers important insights into the process by which social meaning attaches to particular linguistic variables, with implications for the reciprocal relationship between language use, social experience, and ideology. This meaning-making process in turn informs dialect development (Fought, 2006), as different non-standard features originating in transfer phonology become features of a stabilizing dialect. In this dissertation, I use a mixed-
methods approach that integrates quantitative variation analysis of multiple types of naturalistic data with discourse analysis and ethnographic observation to contextualize variable use and uncover stylistic patterning, identity construction, and social meaning. Through this mixed-methods approach, I hope to contribute to a deeper sociophonetic understanding of /ae/ variation in a D.C. Latino context, furthering our view of the social meaning of an emergent ethnolectal language feature in interaction, and of the ways in which processes of language change and maintenance, identity construction and representation are mutually referential.

This dissertation is synchronous rather than longitudinal, addressing language practices in a particular moment in time. It nonetheless informs research on language change by illuminating factors that may affect the coalescence of dialectal repertoires in language-contact situations. This project focuses on variation and stylistic patterning of a dialectal feature shown to be present in other Latino English varieties, low/back /ae/ (as opposed to the more fronted/raised variant common in general American English, especially in pre-nasal contexts). It thus investigates a feature that may be in the process of gaining new social and stylistic meanings, using a close-grained analysis of feature use to uncover what these meanings may be. In this sense it is similar to Labov’s (1963) Martha’s Vineyard study, which showed how variable vowel realizations correlated with speaker orientation to locally salient social groups, giving insight into language change in progress. Identity work has an important part to play in all stages of dialect formation (Coupland, 2008). Further, as Sharma (2011) found, variation in linguistic features can perform stylistic work even when the dialect is “unstable,” or has not yet coalesced. Further, full enregisterment, or the “ideological link(age) of sets of linguistic forms … with social identities has been called ‘enregisterment’” (Johnstone, 2011, p. 657; also see Agha 2003,
is not a prerequisite for stylistic use of features and acquisition of social meaning (Nylund, 2013); rather, stylistic performance can contribute to enregisterment as well as reveal its presence. The investigation of how dialect features (whether L1 substrate features or others) are used stylistically to make identificational, interactional and social meanings can therefore speak to what factors might influence the survival of a particular feature beyond the language-contact phase as a structural element available for social purposes. This focus also responds to Schneider’s (2008) call for research linking “sociopsychological attitudes … and the use of specific linguistic forms” (p. 266) via processes of indexicality (Silverstein, 2003).

Research on ethnolectal language practices is particularly important for understanding identity construction because emergent varieties are often linked with ethnic identity, as in “sounding Latino,” for example. The linguistic features associated with these dialects are often used a means of identifying and (dis)aligning with others (e.g., “talking white”; “wanting to be Black”) in terms of social groups and related ideologies of education, coolness, etc. Through this language use, therefore, the social meanings attached to different linguistic variables can evolve, in the process reifying and reinterpreting existing notions of identity categories, such as what it means to be Latino. The fleeting interactions in which speakers present their individual identities in particular ways can carry far-reaching and enduring consequences for social identity categories such as race and ethnicity that are often assumed to be “natural”, as well as affecting the eventual incorporation of (dis)preferred linguistic features into coalescing dialectal repertoires.

Ethnolects, or non-standard language varieties associated with different ethnocultural social groups (Clyne, 2000; see also Eckert, 2008b), have much to offer our understanding of the
relationship between language elements and systemic structural development, social practices, and identity (Fought, 2006). Despite this theoretical importance, and the importance of Latino Americans as a prominent and fast-growing minority group in the United States, the native English varieties that have arisen in these minority Latino communities remain unevenly studied. The bulk of research on Latino Englishes addresses Chicano English, a dialect spoken by many Mexican Americans; further, relatively little research addresses the development of contact-induced repertoires and the identity potential of language variation patterns. I will discuss this research and research on Latino English in other parts of the United States in chapter 2.

Terminological issues necessarily arise when discussing and investigating peoples of Latin American and Spanish origins. An Internet search of “Latino vs. Hispanic” will result in many contradictory definitions, and the discussion of terminology is very much alive in daily life, in part due to institutionalized procedures such as job applications, which require self-reported ethnicity, and the decennial U.S. Census. Despite this, the term “Latino” as used in English in the United States is generally understood to refer to people of Latin American origin, while “Hispanic” also includes those of Spanish (Iberian) origin (Mora, 2014). “Chicano” is generally understood as a narrower reference to Mexican Americans. In this dissertation, I use the term “Latino” in accordance with much previous linguistic research (e.g., Fought, 2003; Newman, 2010; Slomanson & Newman, 2004). This term is also appropriate for my participants since all are of Latin American origin.

Finally, research on language practices in new and established immigrant communities is of importance to broader issues of diversity and social equity. The U.S. Latino population has grown dramatically, to over 50.5 million people, or more than 16% of the total U.S. population
(Passel, Cohn, & Lopez, 2011). Latinos are the fastest-growing college demographic, accounting for 74% of overall enrollment growth at the university level between 2010 and 2011, and Latinos and other minorities are increasingly represented in new areas as immigration patterns shift from traditional urban destinations to smaller cities emerging as immigrant gateways, suburbs, and rural areas (Frey, 2015; Fry, 2012; Singer, 2004; Wolfram, Cohn, & Price, 2011). Sociolinguistic research can make important contributions in correcting misperceptions of non-standard and ethnolectal language practices as incorrect, uneducated, or learner English. Greater understanding of non-standard language practices as legitimate language systems associated with identity and cultural practices can have a real impact on public awareness and the educational experiences of new generations of Americans.

1.7 Outline of the Dissertation

In this dissertation, I will address the questions I have elucidated above. In chapter 1, I have introduced the dissertation and provided background information on D.C. as a research site, outlined some of the concerns that the study is designed to address, and briefly described the research questions and methodological approach. In chapter 2, I provide a theoretical background that motivates the study and describes its key questions in detail. Chapter 3 explains my methodology and its theoretical justifications, including the recruitment and selection of participants, the various types of data and collection protocols, and coding choices and procedures. The next two chapters address discrete phases of the multi-phase analysis. Chapter 4 presents the results and findings of inter-speaker variation analysis, first addressing social and linguistic factors influencing /æ/ variation in participants as a whole, and then addressing intra-speaker variation analysis by interview topic and interaction type in individual speakers. Chapter
5 expands the analysis with a discourse-analytic case study. In chapter 6, I relate my findings to the research questions posed in chapter 2, and discuss this dissertation’s contributions to scholarly investigation of language, identity, variation, and immigration, and indicate directions for future research.
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND

In this chapter, I establish the theoretical framework of the dissertation and contextualize the project in terms of previous research. I identify questions raised or left unanswered by this research and discuss how this dissertation addresses these gaps and extends previous research. I introduce the /ae/ variable within the context of Chicano English, which is the most-studied Latino English variety. I next discuss the sociolinguistic relationship between structural language elements and social practice, which has important implications both for group and individual identity construction and for systemic language change and development. I focus on key concepts of sociolinguistic variation, style, and identity, and I summarize recent work examining the emergence of new varieties in situations of bilingualism and language contact. I also offer some methodological motivations for the study, describing the importance of qualitative methods in analyzing the linguistic construction of social identities and focusing on discourse analysis as a principled approach to identity in interaction. I conclude the chapter with a discussion of how this dissertation unifies these areas of research, addresses important gaps in each, and makes scholarly contributions with broad applicability in sociolinguistic study.

A reciprocal relationship exists between language systems and individual and social identity, mediated by language as a social practice that draws on and re-configures groups and ideologies relevant to both local and wider social contexts. As numerous studies in sociolinguistics have revealed, speakers draw on available linguistic resources in order to present themselves in particular ways in spoken interactions (see, e.g., Coupland, 1985; Eckert, 1990,
A long tradition of sociolinguistic research since Weinrich, Labov, and Herzog (1968) has established that language variation is not random but systematic and meaningful. Furthermore, synchronic variation may serve as a window into diachronic, long-term linguistic change (Labov, 2001a). As a social practice used to express speaker identity and group identification, stylistic variation can offer key insights into processes of linguistic and social change (Eckert, 2000).

A speaker’s set of available linguistic features, and the social meanings that these can index, relate to language acquisition and exposure as well as to external social factors such as the history of a social group in a particular setting (for example, African Americans and segregation in the United States). These indexical associations can give rise to the association of particular linguistic forms with particular social groups and their attributed characteristics (Silverstein, 2003), causing speakers to use or avoid them as they present themselves in particular ways. Use or avoidance of particular variables may then be informed by the ways speakers relate to conceptualizations of the groups with which they identify or are identified by others. Speakers’ understandings of these meanings can also inform their use or avoidance of variables when achieving interactional work such as speaker alignment and solidarity (Schilling-Estes, 2004).

While interactional work is achieved through micro-level discursive moves such as stance-taking and positioning, it also draws on social attitudes and ideologies about kinds of people and their language use. Thus the stylistic use or avoidance of particular variables by individuals doing interactional identity work draws on and potentially reinterprets group-associational social meanings, which has consequences for meanings within interactions (such as creating solidarity within a conversation) as well as for future understandings of social identity.
categories (for example, what it means to be “articulate while Black”; Alim & Smitherman, 2012).

The relationship between language structures and social practice is of particular interest in situations of mobility, such as immigration, which bring languages and peoples into contact. One key linguistic outcome of language contact is bilingualism, which greatly expands the range of multidimensional variation at the community level, both in terms of language proficiency and in terms of speakers’ repertoires. One important consequence that can result from this contact is phonological transfer, resulting in continued substrate-language influence in future generations of speakers regardless of shifting patterns of language dominance. For example, Spanish substrate influence has been posited as an explanation for a tendency in Latino English varieties towards syllable rather than stress-timing, and for phonological variation such as low, backed /æ/ and raised /ɪ/ (Fought, 2003; Santa Ana, 1996; Shousterman, 2014). Immigration and mobility highlight these processes of self- and other-representation and potential language change, since the social contact and conflict inherent in these situations foregrounds ideologies about different social groups’ place in society and highlights stylistic behavioral practices, amongst which language plays a pivotal role (Eckert, 2011; Hodder, 1982; Labov, 1963).

2.1 Latino Englishes

Ethnolects, or non-standard language varieties associated with different ethnocultural social groups (Clyne, 2000; see also Eckert, 2008b), have much to offer our understanding of the relationships between language elements and systemic structural development, social practices, and identity (Fought, 2006). Despite this theoretical importance, and despite the prominence of
Latino Americans as a fast-growing minority group in the United States, the native English varieties that have arisen in minority Latino communities—known collectively as Latino Englishes—remain generally understudied. Beyond Chicano English, a dialect spoken by many Mexican Americans, little research exists on variation in contact-induced English dialects in other U.S. Latino communities. Research on Chicano English largely focuses on inter-speaker variation analysis (e.g., Bayley, 1994; Fought, 2003; Gordon, 2000; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Roeder, 2009; Santa Ana, 1993; Thomas, 1993, 2001; Wolfram, Carter, & Moriello, 2004); stylistic variation is less well-represented, although important work has been done in the area (Carter, 2007; Eckert, 2008a; Fought, 2003; Mendoza-Denton, 2008). The other primary body of research on Latino language practices focuses on Caribbean Latinos in the New York City area. Wolfram (1974) conducted early research on Puerto Rican English in contact with African American English, and Newman (2010) and Slomanson and Newman (2004) provide careful analyses of phonological variation and prosody in New York Latino English.

Fought (2006) defines Latino English(es) as

non-standard varieties that show the influence of language contact from Spanish (and potentially other varieties), particularly in the phonology. Often they develop as elaborated and regularized native-speaker versions of what were historically non-native-speaker varieties. (p. 74)

Importantly, these are not “imperfect” or learner Englishes but native English varieties that emerge in Latino communities via inter-generational bilingualism, which “(have) been influenced by Spanish but (are) not dependent on [individual] bilingualism per se” (Wolfram &

---

While ambiguity and debate over the terms “Latino” versus “Hispanic” is ongoing, in this dissertation I use “Latino” in keeping with Fought (2003) and in line with my general preference. For a more in-depth discussion of terms, please refer to chapter 1.
Schilling-Estes, 2006, p. 197). Latino Englishes are spoken by bilingual and monolingual speakers in communities with a range of stages of bilingualism and language shift. While distinguishing features of Latino Englishes may originally be attributable to Spanish transfer into non-native English, they become part of the systemic dialectal repertoire available to subsequent generations of speakers who are English-dominant or even monolingual. The question of dialectal boundaries is perennial, particularly in communities where continuous immigration constantly refreshes language contact and bilingualism (Roeder, 2010). The key point is that Latino Englishes are not “flawed” or “learner” English. They are internally consistent systems that emerge over time and are available to different generations of speakers with a range of proficiencies in both English and Spanish. Thus ethnolectal variants originating in language transfer become dialectal features with indexical associations, which become available for stylistic identity work (Eckert, 2008b). For many U.S. Latinos, this identity work takes place primarily in English. As Fought (2006) notes,

> the linguistic expression of identity for Latinos and Latinas in the USA is not only or even primarily signaled by an ability to speak Spanish. A large number of the speakers born here, especially from the third generation and later, are completely monolingual … so they must mark their ethnicity with resources other than the use of Spanish. (p. 70)

In this identity work, however, speakers may “draw upon the symbolic repertoire of Spanish phonology” using non-standard transfer features that have become part of the dialectal repertoire (Mendoza-Denton, 2008, p. 208).

Despite their significance for their speakers, however, Latino Englishes remain under-examined and unequally studied. The bulk of research conducted on Latino English has addressed one variety, Chicano (Mexican-American) English, in historically Mexican-American

2.1.1 Chicano English

Chicano English is the most-studied variety of Latino English. It is spoken in Mexican American ethnic communities in the western and southwestern U.S. and elsewhere, often by U.S.-born second- and third-generation immigrants. It has been studied in East Los Angeles, Texas, and parts of the Midwest, and has been identified as a distinct English variety based on
phonology, intonation, syllable timing (vs. the stress timing of native U.S. English), and syntactic elements (Bayley, 1994; Fought, 2003; Thomas, 1993, 2001; Roeder, 2010; Santa Ana, 1993). While non-standard Chicano English features may have originated in Spanish language transfer, they may be preserved by subsequent generations of Chicanos who are monolingual in English; hence the features may become available for stylistic performance and identity construction, including ethnic identities (Eckert, 2008a).

While Chicano English shares many features with other American English dialects, it can be distinguished from them since it varies systematically on structural levels such as phonology, morphosyntax, syllable-timing, and intonation. The presence of multiple Chicano English elements, and the absence of features characteristic of non-native English, therefore indicates the presence of Chicano English as a distinct dialect, rather than non-native English. In this dissertation, I focus on phonological variation in a particular linguistic element, the low front vowel /æ/. However, observation of co-occurring features can provide a general sense of a potentially coalescing Latino English variety in Washington, D.C. I therefore provide a brief review of key Chicano English phonological features that might be expected to occur in other Latino English varieties. In this I will use Wells’ (1982) word classes, as in other parts of this dissertation. I will then briefly discuss features that distinguish Chicano English from non-native English, and features that are shared by Chicano English and non-native English but that differ in terms of frequency.

Key phonological features of Chicano English include little reduction of unstressed high vowels /i u/, as in “beet” and “boot”; /ɪ/ (“bit”) raising towards /i/ (“beet”), particularly when preceding alveolar and velar nasals (Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Bayley & Santa Ana, 2004);
fronting of the /ʌ/ vowel, as in “cot”; centralization of pre-rhotic /ɛ/ (“bet”); and reduced or variable gliding in the diphthongs /ij uw ej ow/ (Fought, 2003; Santa Ana, 1991). In terms of consonants, trilled /ɾ/ is observed, as are different forms of alveolar stops (/t d/). These include fricative stopping (e.g. [t d] for /ɵ ð/), unreleased and glottalized final stops, stop deletion before pauses, and consonant cluster reduction.

Importantly, phonological features of Chicano English and, by extension, other Latino English varieties, can be distinguished from the L2 English of native Spanish speakers (i.e. L2 English from Spanish) (Fought, 2003). Non-native English shows a lack of phonemic distinction between /ɛ/ and /ae/; a lack of phonemic distinction between /ɪ/ and /i/, with categorical rather than variable /ɪ/ raising; a tendency to substitute phonetic /a/ for schwa /ə/, and vice versa; frequent lack of off-gliding in /aw/; nasalized vowels; and other linguistic behavior absent from Latino Englishes, such as epenthetic schwa (“espent” for “spent”). Non-native English also shows different consonantal patterns than Chicano English. For example, non-native English does not follow English flapping rules for intervocalic stops (which tend to be fully realized as [t d] rather than [ɾ]), and variably substitutes uses the voiceless velar fricative [x] for /h/ and fricative [ʃ] for /tʃ/ (e.g., “shurch” for “church”, a feature which may have been lost by monolinguals due to a high degree of social stigmatization; Fought, 2003; Wald, 1984). Non-native English also shows different stop-glottalization patterns than Chicano English and exhibits more frequent fricative stopping, devoicing of final consonants, particularly stops (e.g. “spent” for “spend”), and single consonant deletion (Fought, 2003; Carter, 2007, Peñalosa, 1980, Roeder, 2010, Thomas, 2001, Santa Ana, 1991, 1996; Wald; 1984; Wolfram, Carter, & Moriello, 2004).
2.1.2 Phonological variation: /æ/

While of interest, the documentation of the complete sound system of a potential “Latino English” variety in Washington, D.C. lies beyond the scope of this dissertation. Of the extensive list above, I selected the low, front vowel /æ/ (as in “ash”) as the variable under study due to its well-documented status as a variable of particular sociolinguistic interest. In this section, I will provide an overview of /æ/ variation in American English dialects generally and in Chicano English specifically.

One reason why the /æ/ feature is of general interest to linguistics is because its movement within the vowel space is influential in changes in American English dialectal systems (Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006, pp. 18-19). The general American English pattern of /æ/-raising and tensing before nasal consonants is well established (Labov et al., 2006; also see Thomas’s [2001] summary of American English vowel variation). In this pattern, /æ/ raises and fronts before nasal sounds in general American English, such that “can” resembles “kay-un”. This pattern is widely attested among European American speakers and has been observed, though less thoroughly studied, in African American English dialects (Deser, 1989). Regional varieties of American English demonstrate other patterns of /æ/ variation, namely the Northern Cities pattern characteristic of the Midwest, the New York City and Philadelphia split-/æ/ systems, and the California vowel system. A distinctive Southern breaking pattern, where /æ/ diphthongizes or even forms triphthongs, has also been observed. Briefly put, these regional patterns show /æ/ tensing in different phonetically and sometimes lexically conditioned environments, which is potentially linked to dialect mixing due to historical patterns of migrations within the United States (Labov, 2010). The geographical regions of American English dialects are shown in this map modified from Labov et al. (2006) (Figure 2).
The position of /æ/ within the vowel space affects and responds to the position of other vowels. For example, in the Northern Cities vowel shift of the Inland North region, /æ/ raising has become generalized from pre-nasal position to categorical raising, such that not only “can” raises to “kay-an” but “cat” raises to “ket”. This intrusion of /æ/ into /ɛ/ vowel space is hypothesized to have had a triggering “pull” effect on the vowel system as a whole, as vowels shifted in order to maintain perceptual distinction.
In contrast, the California vowel shift at first glance has a simpler or “pure” nasal pattern (Eckert, 2008b), where /ae/ -tensing is conditioned only by following nasal environment. However, /ae/ appears to be backing and lowering in other contexts, perhaps due to merger of the “cot/caught” vowels, which opens up space in the vowel system, causing a “pull” effect which shifts non-nasal /ae/ towards the back of the vowel space (Eckert, 2008b; Hall-Lew, 2009; Moonwomon, 1992).

The Mid-Atlantic region shows famously complex /ae/ conditioning patterns, with a phonemic split observed due to /ae/ raising and fronting in pre-nasal position and in particular phonetically- and lexically-conditioned environments. In New York City, for example, /ae/ raises
and fronts pre-nasally, as in the general American pattern, but also raises and fronts before voiced stops, voiceless fricatives, and in certain lexical items (Labov, 1994, 2007; Labov et al., 2006; Wong, 2007, p. 223;). The Philadelphia split short-a system is simpler: /ae/ raises and fronts pre-nasally, before voiceless fricatives, and in specific lexical contexts before voiced stops, e.g. “mad”, “bad”, “glad” (Labov et al., 2006, p. 237). Recent research on both dialects has shown that these systems are simplifying in younger speakers so that the pre-nasal raising pattern remains, but /ae/-tensing is lost in other environments (Labov, Rosenfelder, & Fruehwald, 2013; Wong, 2007; Becker & Wong, 2010). These shifts are sensitive to social factors, specifically higher education and contact with speakers of other dialects (Labov, Rosenfelder, & Fruehwald, 2013; Prichard & Tamminga, 2012).

Finally, in the Southern breaking pattern, /ae/ lengthens and “breaks” in all contexts, developing off-glides and even epenthetic schwas to become diphthongized or triphthongized (“can” [kæn] as “kay-an” [kæjn] or “ka-yuh-an” [kæjən]) in what is often characterized as the “Southern drawl.” This pattern likely has its origins in universals of vowel-lengthening before voiced consonants and may influence the Southern Vowel Shift more generally (Irons, 2007).

To my knowledge, this dissertation represents the first study of Latino /ae/ in Washington D.C. Little research exists on /ae/ in the D.C. metropolitan area. Based on the Atlas of North American English (Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006), /ae/ in D.C. shows a nasal-raising pattern consistent with general American English. While the Atlas of North American English did not document Washington, D.C. participants’ race or ethnicity, this finding is consistent with my own data on general American /ae/ in white D.C. speakers from the Georgetown University Language and Communication in Washington, D.C. (LCDC) project. The LCDC project
comprises quantitative and qualitative research on an ongoing database of sociolinguistic interviews with adult male and female residents of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area (European American, African American, Latino, including the interviews collected in the present study, and Asian American) and has been active since 2006. While the Atlas of North American English locates D.C. between the mid-Atlantic and southern dialect regions, I heard no evidence of either the mid-Atlantic or Southern breaking /ae/ patterns in my speakers or the European American LCDC comparison group. Findings will be discussed in detail in the chapters that follow. Research on /ae/ in D.C. African Americans is to my knowledge undocumented, but presents an important and necessary direction for future study.

The examples I have given demonstrate the importance of /ae/ in American English vowel systems, and they suggest that the variable may be influenced by sociolinguistic factors and identity work. These patterns of variation can affect the development of phonological systems as a whole (Eckert, 2000; Labov, 1994). I now turn to a brief description of /ae/ in Chicano English, the only variety of Latino English in which /ae/ has been studied to my knowledge.

Chicano English /ae/ variation from general American English and has been shown to be socially conditioned (Gordon, 2000; Roeder, 2010). This indicates that the feature has reached the sociolinguistic marker stage and is available for agentive stylistic use in identity construction (Eckert, 1996), although much research remains to be done on its possible social meanings. Hillenbrand, Getty, Clark and Wheeler (1995) measure the average F1 and F2 formant values of female television presenters (considered to speak general American English, the unmarked
“standard” dialect) as 669 hertz and 2349 hertz, respectively\(^d\). These measurements place
“general American English” /æ/ (indicated by a circle in figure 5 below) higher up and further
forward in the vowel space than the Mexican-American speaker’s realization. This low, backed
tendency (Eckert, 2008a; Thomas, Kendall & Shouten, 2010) is particularly evident in pre-nasal
position (Thomas, 2001), a point which I will further elaborate in chapter 4.

Figure 5. Vowel chart of Mexican American English, adapted from Roeder (2012), p. 167.

Chicano English /æ/ variation is sensitive to sociolinguistic patterning. For example,
Chicano English speakers in the Northern Cities area display /æ/ realizations that are lowered
and backed, in accordance with the Chicano English pronunciation, and realizations that are

\(^d\) While Labov et al. (2006) note that no single “general American English” variety exists, broadcaster speech is
popularly considered to represent the unmarked “standard” American English associated with the American
Midlands region outside the Northern Cities vowel-shifted area. Characteristics of the speech of this region are often
considered the “default traits when … marked local dialect features are eroded” (Labov et al. 2006, p. 262).
Americans tend to regard general American English as an “informal standard” (Wolfram, Adger, & Christian, 1999),
which contrasts with marked ethnic varieties often considered to be “accented” or “ghetto” (Campbell-Kibler, 2011,
p. 288)
raised and fronted in accordance with local Northern Cities-shifted Anglo English patterns. The variation shows the classic age/gender patterns of an incoming linguistic innovation, with young women using the more innovative Northern Cities shifted variants and older male speakers using the more conservative “ethnolectal” variant (Roeder, 2010). This finding runs counter to the influential assumption that minority communities do not participate in majority-group sound changes (Labov, 1966, 1994).

Roeder’s (2010) variation research on a Mexican-American community in Michigan found complex age- and gender-patterning for pre-nasal /ae/. Middle-aged men exhibited an unraised pattern, indicating that older men in this community may be slower to adapt or even resistant phonological accommodation to the local norm, possibly due to associations between the unraised /ae/ realization and Latino language and identity (Roeder, 2010). In contrast, young women showed more frequent and more extreme Northern Cities /ae/ raising than their Anglo peers, a finding consistent with much sociolinguistic research on young women as leading the adoption of sound changes in their communities (for example, Eckert, 1990; Labov, 1990). Similarly, Gordon (2000) found /ae/ realization to be generally unraised in the speech of Mexican Americans in Indiana, contrasting with both the general American English pattern and the local, majority-group Northern Cities Vowel Shift (p. 163). However, one female Mexican-American speaker who was raised in a non-ethnic neighborhood, inhabited an all-white friend network, and showed an ambiguous attitude towards Mexican-American identity conformed to the Anglo pattern. Gordon’s (2000) study therefore indicates that social orientation and an individual’s social networks play a role in speaker accommodation of majority-group variation, a finding similar to Wolfram, Carter and Moriello’s (2004) preliminary indications that
monophthongization of Southern White English /ay/ vowels by adolescent Latino immigrant speakers in North Carolina related to their alignments with local peer groups.

The Chicano English pronunciation may originally have been a consequence of transfer from Spanish, which lacks an equivalent to the English low, front, lax vowel (Gorman & Kester, 2004; MacDonald, 1989). However, since Chicano English is now a dialect used by many monolingual English speakers (Fought, 2003), the contrast between its low, backed realization and general American English patterns makes it available for social variation and as a stylistic resource for identity performance (Eckert, 2008a). Since substrate-origin phonology is key in indexing ethnicity and other aspects of identity (Fought, 2006), I anticipated that stylistic performance employing phonetic variation would be present and salient in the speech of D.C.-area Latinos. Little research has directly addressed the social meaning of /ae/ for Latinos, and its potential field of indexical meanings (Eckert, 2008b) remains to be fully documented. However, previous research indicates that this variable is stylistically available, with social associations including (but not limited to) language proficiency or ethnic group belonging (Eckert, 2008a). For example, my pilot study results suggested that low backed realizations are used with higher frequency when speakers talk about Latino culture, but with lower frequency when they wish to sound authoritative, indicating that although Latinos in D.C. may be internalizing derogatory attitudes toward Latino English(es), they nonetheless retain a positive sense of their unique cultural and linguistic heritage (Tseng, 2011).

These pilot-study findings of stylistic /ae/ variation are consistent with previous research on Chicano English /ae/ in different U.S. contexts, which establish that the feature is potentially available for socially-meaningful variation in contact between Latinos and European Americans.
Eckert’s (1996, 2008a) study of two middle schools in Northern California found that while the low, backed Chicano English realization contrasted meaningfully with the nasal-raised and fronted California Anglo pattern, there was no direct relationship between the low, backed realization and Chicano ethnic identity. Rather, Eckert found low, backed /æ/ to index more subtle local meanings of toughness and coolness associated with a mostly, but not exclusively, Mexican-American adolescent “in-crowd.” Fought’s (2003) study of high-school students in Northern California found suggestive gender and gang affiliation patterns across linguistic environments: women and non-gang members used the backed variant most frequently, but gang members raised /æ/ more frequently. While findings were inconclusive, Fought (2003) demonstrated that minority groups can participate in majority-group sound changes, and suggested that, in the context of other local vowel-raising patterns, /æ/ raising in this particular community may index toughness. Fought’s findings indicate that vowel raising and backing may operate independently in terms of social meaning, and that patterns may be interpretable in relationship to other linguistic variables as speakers draw on features that index community-specific social norms and social meanings. This highlights the need to ground interpretations of sociolinguistic variation in the local sociolinguistic environment, rather than assuming monolithic assignations of a single meaning per variable (Eckert, 2008b; Schilling-Estes, 2004). Finally, Carter’s (2007) longitudinal study of a Mexican-American girl in North Carolina found that her /æ/ realization shifted from a nasal-raising pattern which she acquired in pre-adolescence, to the backed, lowered “ethnolectal” variant. Based on his longitudinal ethnographic observations, he concludes that this change may be motivated by pressure to conform to existing racialized social ideologies in adolescence.
While these studies do not exhaustively catalog /æ/’s potential social meanings, they do establish /æ/’s stylistic potential as a variable that can index ethnicity and more nuanced social meanings on the individual level and in broader usage. Crucially, although Latino Englishes are native English varieties, the identity potential of their unique features is available to both monolingual and bilingual speakers (Sharma, 2005). Similarly, Roeder’s (2010) work indicates that /æ/’s stylistic potential may be available in communities where assimilation to the “majority” English speech norm is in various stages of completion. The use of contact and “majority” sound changes by minority speakers on group and individual levels may thus relate to localness and ethnicity as different aspects of identity; as Fought (2006) notes, “individuals within the group may participate to varying degrees, often in relation to other elements of their identity such as network integration” (pp. 149-150). Style and variation research on phonological variables in less-studied Latino groups can therefore provide a meaningful comparison with research on Chicano English and can increase our general understanding of ethnolectal formation. Yet despite its significant potential, research in this area remains generally lacking. The present study aims to address this lack.

2.2 Language and Identity

Sociolinguistics is concerned with the relationship between language and society, specifically, the reciprocal relationship between language practices and social context, in which factors in each are mutually influential. Linguistic identity construction, or self-presentation in interaction, reflects social associations and ideologies, constructs individual and group social identities, and affects individual and group language patterns with potential consequences for language system changes.
Social theory in the past decades has moved beyond static and essentializing concepts of identity as an individualistic, Cartesian mental aggregate or a conjunction of etic social categories and fixed traits. Instead, contemporary theory understands identity to be constructed dynamically through social interaction, and both individual self-definition and social-group categorizations and behavior play a role in that construction. Language is a key resource that speakers use to project identity by presenting themselves in particular ways: speakers share and invite others to participate in their understanding of the world through linguistic acts of self-projection, or “acts of identity” (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985). As Coupland (2001) notes, “we can only understand self-identity in an interactive and sociolinguistic sense … people’s identities are embodied sociolinguistically” (p. 202-203).

Sociolinguistic variation plays a key role in the construction of different ethnic identities. Linguistically, racially and ethnically marked social groups are often associated with particular vernaculars that have their roots in multilingual origins and sociohistorical circumstances such as racial segregation (e.g., African American English; Chicano English). These “ethnolectal”^e varieties can be used for identity signaling and in-group formation and are often assigned community-specific “covert prestige” (Labov, 1972b, p. 249). However, current and historical discrimination means these dialects are often stigmatized and marked as low-prestige in the wider community. While discrimination against ethnic-associated and non-standard “vernacular” forms of language is well documented (Alim & Smitherman, 2012; Labov, 2001a, 2007; Lippi-Green, 2011; Purnell, Idsardi, & Baugh, 1999; Rickford, 1999), general American English is

---

^e I concur with Eckert (2008a) and Jaspers (2008) on problematic aspects of using “ethnolect” to refer to the speech of different ethnic groups, namely linguistic essentialism and the assignment of “ethnicity” only to marked, minority-group speakers. For ease of reference, however, I use the term when discussing Latino English, as is common practice in the field (Clyne, 2000).
typically considered to be unmarked and is privileged by lack of overt stigma and by associations of linguistic correctness (Lippi-Green, 1997; Bucholtz, 2001). Associations of pride and shame can thus co-exist within communities and individual speakers.

While this dissertation does not focus on the question of “standard” versus “non-standard” or “vernacular” forms, it must be noted that the “unmarked” general American varieties or “informal standards” (Wolfram, Adger, & Christian, 1999), which contrast with marked ethnic varieties often considered to be “accented” or “ghetto” (Campbell-Kibler, 2011, p. 288), are also socially and ideologically relevant, being associated with ideologies of correctness, education, social status (middle-class), and race (white). Urcioli (1996) explains in detail the relationship between negative evaluation of “ethnolectal” language practices by racially and ethnically marked social groups (e.g., Puerto Ricans), and the unmarked but socially valued practices of the white majority. Importantly, she demonstrates that these attitudes circulate among minority-group speakers and affect their evaluation of language practices as linked to social class, which in turn is often related to level of education (Labov, 1966). In a further example of associations between standard varieties and the social attributes of race and education, Bucholtz (2001) found that teenagers used hyper-standard linguistic features to index “nerd” identities associated with academic achievement and whiteness, regardless of the speaker’s own ethnicity. Importantly, the potential for social meaning rests on distinction (Irvine, 2001). The study of variation patterns can reveal social awareness of linguistic features as “markers” of different social groups; however, the enregisterment of features, their participation in dialectal systems, or their acknowledged status as stereotypes (Agha, 2003; Labov, 1972a) are not necessarily prerequisites for social marking and stylistic identity work (Nylund, 2013).
In addition to associations with particular social groups, the meanings indexed by particular ways of speaking also reflect broader ideological constructs about “kinds of people” (for example, “What Latinos are like”, or conflation of immigration status with morality; Santa Ana, 2002; Relaño Pastor & De Fina, 2005). These ideologies circulate in the social environment both locally and more widely. (For a discussion of the diffusion of social stereotypes through the media, see, e.g., Agha 2003.)

The use and avoidance of non-standard features therefore plays an important role in linguistic identity display for minority speakers. Individuals’ speech patterns in interaction draw on macro-level linguistic patterns and correlations of language behavior with different social groups, as well as ideologies about different groups, different “kinds of people,” and the kinds of behavior attributed to them: “ideological work converts perceived variation of sound into perceived contrasts of social persona and identity” (Agha, 2003). This language use in turn may affect the evolution of language systems, contribute to systemic change in dialect systems, and effect changes in group identity via changing associations (Johnstone, 2004). For example, Johnstone (2010a) and Johnstone and Kiesling (2008) found that Pittsburgh speakers selectively use different features of the local “Pittsburghese” dialect as an index of local identity, where indexicality is understood as the association of different linguistic forms with social groups through observed correlative behavior (“nth order indexicalities”), and with these groups’ attributed qualities (“n+1”) (Silverstein, 2003). While these features likely originated with contact between European speakers of different English dialects, over time they became
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1 Note that Silverstein’s (2003) orders of indexicality refer not to chronological development of indexical meanings, or to the primacy of one meaning over another, but to degree of closeness from the original association of a linguistic feature with a social group based on perceived correlation, or its more-removed association with social qualities attributed to this group.
available as indexes of social (working) class and geographically based local identity. Similarly, Eckert (2000) found that teenagers with different social positions vis-à-vis the local social order, both within their high school and in Detroit more broadly, used the Northern Cities Vowel Shift to greater or lesser degrees in their speech as an index of social values within these contexts (toughness; conformity). Kiesling (2004) shows that “dude” has become disassociated from original associations with California surfer and “druggie” subcultures to become a discourse marker indexing casual solidarity and linked to masculinity. Similarly, Bucholtz (2009) shows that indexical meanings of “güey”, the Mexican Spanish equivalent to dude, have become further refined in California: from indexing a stance of “cool solidarity” (Kiesling, 2004, p. 282), “güey” is now associated with middle-class masculinity practices in the Mexican-American context (Bucholtz, 2009, p. 164).

The relationship between language and society is particularly interesting in terms of race and ethnicity. Race and ethnicity are social categories that carry a rich array of stereotypes or “social figures” (Agha, 2007). They are assumed to be “natural” and inscribed onto speakers’ bodies, and they are often identified with language practices and localized in particular geographies (Silverstein, 2011). They are also socially marked, existing in opposition to unmarked, often majority-group categories (for example, “white American” versus marked racial and ethnic groups in the United States). Race and ethnicity are socially constructed through language as well as other practices: “ethnic groups do not exist a priori but are socially-constructed phenomena that come into being through the discourse of members and non-members” (Benor, 2010, p. 170). However, these imagined communities (Anderson, 1983) nonetheless have concrete and significant impacts on speakers’ lives. Speaker agency is therefore
not without its limits: linguistic identity display is intimately related to and constrained by
concepts of race and ethnicity are social realities because they are deeply rooted in the
consciousness of individuals and groups, and because they are firmly fixed in our society’s
institutional life” (as cited in Fought 2006, p. 5). She goes on to note, “Regardless of the social
relativity of their definitions, or of whether we believe that race and ethnicity should or should
not have the prominent role in society that they have, we cannot dismiss them as having no basis
in reality. The ideologies associated with them create their own social reality” (Fought 2006, p. 5).

In the United States, race and ethnicity are particularly salient identity constructs, given
the country’s history of race-based segregation and ongoing institutional application of racial and
ethnic categories via practices such as the U.S. Census (Bailey, 2001a; De Fina, 2013b; Fought,
2006; Leeman, 2004). For example, Bailey (2001b) found that Dominican teenagers’ use of
African American English features and English-Spanish code-switching was constrained by
others’ perceptions of them based on “race” or phenotype. While all teens used both African
American English and Dominican Spanish, phenotypically black teenagers were more aware of
Spanish as a means of distinguishing themselves from African Americans and associated
negative Discourses of “blackness” salient in both the United States and the Dominican
Republic; they were also obligated to perform more displays of Spanish competency in order to
be perceived as “Latino”. “Being Dominican” for these speakers therefore comprised a
complicated balance of linguistic self-representation.
In sum, research on language as a social practice (Eckert, 2000), specifically the socially motivated use of contrasting linguistic features in synchronic studies, can shed light on the interactional processes effecting long-term changes in systemic language use and individual and group identity construction. The studies I have discussed above demonstrate the important role that linguistic variation and creative language use play in identity construction, while still drawing on macro-level linguistic structures and associations of speech patterns with different types of people and social groups. In this sense, micro-level linguistic practices that take place in interaction are interwoven with macro-level language and social structures, including ideology. These studies also demonstrate that patterns of language usage and social practice can only be understood in context. The relationship between language and identity therefore necessitates an integrated approach to the different meanings a linguistic variant may index in interaction. This is in line with Bell’s (2013) argument for analyses combining quantification of linguistic variables, individual use of linguistic features, and their relationship to other features: “blending of quantitative, qualitative, co-occurrence analysis … [is] a powerful tool to understand linguistic style” (p. 308; also see Bell (2001)). In this dissertation, I use quantitative and qualitative methods centering on sociolinguistic variation, qualitative token patterning, constellation of /ae/ with other linguistic features, and discourse analytic procedures to examine /ae/ variation and social meaning in the speech of first- and second-generation Latino immigrants.

2.3 Sociolinguistic Variation

Inter- and intraspeaker linguistic variation is fundamental to the sociolinguistic construction of identity. Variation plays a key role in language change in terms of both system-internal linguistic factors and system-external social factors. Research on language variation and
change over several decades has shown that phonetic variation, or different realizations of the same phonological feature, can be socially as well as linguistically conditioned, and that synchronic variation, or variation at a given moment in time, is a necessary precursor to diachronic linguistic change (Weinreich, Labov & Herzog, 1968; Labov, 2001). Recent sociophonetic approaches utilizing instrumental techniques such as acoustic phonetic analysis make important contributions to our understanding of variation, social identity, and language change (Baranowski, 2013; Thomas, 2011).

In sociolinguistic variation, real and perceived correlations between patterns of language variation and demographic categories (class, sex, race, etc.) can lead to the use or avoidance of particular variants by groups and individuals for purposes of self-representation and interactional work. A helpful framework here can be found in Labov’s (1972a) distinction between indicators, markers, and stereotypes (p. 205). These terms refer to the use of linguistic variables at different stages in the related processes of language change and social valuation. Indicators are features that vary by social groupings but do not manifest social valuation. Markers are features whose variation patterns manifest social awareness in usage, such as style shifting using ethnolectal variants in casual versus formal interactions or in relationship to different topics or different interlocutors. This stylistic usage demonstrates that features hold social meaning, but the features are not overtly commented upon by speakers. Finally, stereotypes refer to linguistic features that are overtly commented on by speakers as being representative of certain social associations, for example New York City r-lessness. Stereotypes therefore are features that “have risen to full social consciousness” in terms of their representation of social values (Labov, 1972a, p. 205).
Many variation studies address linguistic variation across different speakers on a group level. Foundational work by Labov (1966) addressed the relationship between the use of particular variants (in this case, New York City r-lessness) and broad social categories such as age, sex, and social class, setting the stage for extensive subsequent research that focused on correlations between phonological variation and broad demographic categories. This research addressed linguistic changes in progress in geographically defined communities and has resulted in the important documentation of phonological system changes such as the Northern Cities Vowel Shift (Labov, Yaeger, & Steiner, 1972). Variationist research in this tradition established that an observable correlation often exists between social groupings (e.g., race, geographic area, sex, social class) and the use of particular linguistic variants. These studies documented indicators, such as the merging of the low-back vowels /ɑ/ and /ɔ/ in most of the United States; markers, such as Fischer’s (1958) finding that g-dropping (“walkin’” versus “walking”) patterned by sex and social class, but was unremarked upon by speakers; and stereotypes, such as the well-known case of r-lessness in New York City, which was associated with social class and linguistic correctness (Labov, 1966, 1972a). These studies established that linguistic variation is sensitive to social categories and to social-category associations; however, their focus on the correlation of variability among speakers with external factors did not directly address the relationship between form and social meaning.

More recent research highlights the importance of social context, interaction, and social practice in linguistic variation. For example, Eckert’s (1990) findings showed that that orientation to and participation in local social groups and identities (“jocks” and “burnouts”) was a significant factor in Detroit teenagers’ use of Northern Cities-shifted vowels. Speakers’
understanding and use of Northern Cities vowels was related to the social meaning they attached to particular social figures: “iconic” teenagers (Eckert, 1996) demonstrated the most extreme social and linguistic behavior, which reinforced the locally salient meanings of the shifted variants and served as a benchmark against which other teenagers constructed their own identities. Gendered patterning was apparent, but it reflected local identities (such as “burnout” identities associated with toughness or rebellion), rather than biological sex per se. To other communities, the same Northern Cities vowels might index different social meanings: Kaiser (2011) found Northern Cities vowels to be one means by which listeners identified speakers’ ethnicity as Hmong or Anglo-American, an important social distinction in the Twin Cities area of Minnesota. Similarly, Milroy’s (1980, 2002; Milroy & Milroy, 1992) research on Belfast, Northern Ireland, found that use of Belfast variables in working-class neighborhoods was not a function of age and gender per se, but rather reflected age- and gender-related differences in social networks based on employment patterns, which affected the degree of contact speakers had with non-community members.

2.3.1 Style

Recent focus on stylistic or intra-speaker variation, the patterns of variation within a single individual’s speech (Bell, 1984; Schilling, 2013b, p. 327), provides insight into the relationship between language and social meaning by examining the creative use of variation in interaction. Research on style has developed far beyond Labov’s (1972) initial framework, in which variation in individuals’ speech was seen as a “largely reactive phenomenon, conditioned by the formality of the speech context” (Schilling, 2013b, p. 327). Current approaches to style developed by Bell (1984, 2001), Coupland (2007) and Schilling-Estes (2004), among others, emphasize speaker agency: “linguistic variation (is seen) as a key resource whereby individuals
shape and reshape personal identities, interpersonal interactions, group memberships, social orders, and ways of thinking (i.e. attitudes, ideologies)” (Schilling, 2013b, p. 327). Importantly, while style is creative and agentive, speakers do not necessarily make conscious choices about the use of a particular variant in a given context. As Labov (1972a) notes, the use of linguistic variants, particularly in terms of phonological variation, can take place below the level of consciousness and control, and different aspects of the speech context such as audience, interlocutor, type of encounter, and formality can affect variation. This subconscious awareness recalls Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of “habitus”, which holds that while individual behavior is agentive insofar as it is embodied in social actors, this behavior is neither purely rational nor wildly creative but is instead habitual and socially conditioned; “predispositions are shaped by the social structures from which they emerge … [and] lead the individuals to produces actions and representations that will either reproduce or transform those social structures” (Bourdieu, 1977, as cited in Ahearn, 2012, p. 266). However, speakers do make agentive use of stylistic variation related to the indexed social meanings of different linguistic elements. I provide key examples of these processes below.

Bell’s (1984, 2001) foundational work on agency and linguistic style posited that speakers shift between available styles (for example, using both Maori English and New Zealand English phonology and discourse markers) in an attempt to align with their interlocutors, or with absent “referee” groups with which they wish to identify. This approach to style has become known as audience design or referee design. Bell’s later conceptualizations of style address both “responsive” style, or the use of different variants in response to the (perceived) audience (Bell, 2001, p. 147) and “initiative design,” in which speakers “redefine the situation” through stylistic

Testing Bell’s hypotheses that variation is responsive to audience, Rickford and McNair-Knox (1994) found that style shifting between African American Vernacular English (AAVE) morphosyntactic forms and a more standard variety by “Foxy Boston,” a teenage African-American girl, was influenced by both topic and multiple social factors related to audience (for example, interviewer age, ethnicity, and familiarity). A subsequent study (Rickford & Price, 2013) found that Foxy’s vernacular usage showed age-grading, becoming less pronounced as she became an adult and took on new social roles, but style shifting continued to be an important social practice for her self-representation in different interactional contexts, for example when contrasting the continued irresponsible behavior of others (“fish frys and blunts”) with her own day-care business (p. 171). Studies like those I have just described highlight the complexity of factors that can influence style shifting, and the agentive role speakers play in this behavior.

Speakers also use style for agentive linguistic identity displays: As Coupland notes, “Style, and in particular dialect style, can … be construed as a special case of the presentation of self, within particular relational contexts – articulating relational goals and identity goals” (2001, p. 197). This identity work includes but is not limited to group affiliation: “the designing of acts of linguistic display [is] geared to the speaker’s self-perceptions, projecting various versions of his or her social and personal identity” (Coupland, 2001, p. 200). This view extends Bell’s (2001) theory of referee design, in which speakers index absent social referent groups via the use of associated linguistic forms in order to position themselves in particular ways in discourse. In agentive approaches to variation, style is considered to create identity as speakers present themselves in different ways in unfolding talk. This creative usage draws on existing social
referents, such as understandings of social groups and their attributed behaviors and qualities. For example, Schilling-Estes (2004) found that speakers shifted agentively within a single multi-party interview in order to position themselves in relationship to other speakers vis-a-vis locally and more broadly salient ideologies of race relations and history. However, this usage can also create new meanings. Eckert (1996), for example, found that Chicano English vowels were used by Latino and non-Latino adolescents alike to index not ethnicity specifically, but locally salient meanings of toughness and coolness associated with the non-white “popular crowd”. Since studies in this tradition focus on the interaction between language and the social meanings that attach to a particular realization of a linguistic variant or aggregate of variants at different levels of indexicality (Eckert, 2005; Silverstein, 2003), they often highlight different aspects of the meaning-making process by which indicators can become markers and markers become stereotypes. These meanings are embedded in the broader social and historical context. For example, in Labov’s (1963) foundational work on variation, ethnicity, and local identity in Martha’s Vineyard, particular vowel realizations were used by speakers who affiliated with an “authentic,” “traditional” local identity in the face of tourism-induced social change. Similarly, Schilling-Estes (1998) found that speakers on the North Carolina island of Ocracoke could use the distinctive local brogue to enact particular personae, such as that of a “local fisherman”.

Linguistic identity construction can take place through extremely subtle correlations. Podesva’s (2007) study of a single speaker in different interactional contexts showed that extremely fine-grained phonetic detail can relate to interactional construction of personae. By looking at the clustering of a particular linguistic resource (falsetto) at interactionally important moments in discourse, Podesva (2007) was able to compare usage patterns across interactions to

48
observe the creation of a particular “Diva” persona. As with Schilling-Estes (2004), this study showed that detailed analysis of the interactional speech of a few individuals can more adequately account for the stylistic meaning of variables in general than can larger-group studies sampling language practice and identity display at more superficial levels. Contextualized against a backdrop of bigger-picture sociolinguistic connections, small-group studies therefore provide an important means of examining stylistic variation as a “resource for the construction of social meaning … Finer-grained analyses delving deep into an individual’s linguistic performances … may offer more insight into why speakers make the linguistic choices they do” (Podesva, 2007, p. 481).

This recent focus on style and agentive identity display has shifted analytic focus from emphasis on languages and dialects as bounded systems of structural features, to more flexible concepts such as repertoire. Benor’s (2010) concept of repertoire resembles Fought’s (2006) “pool of resources from which members of a speech community draw the linguistic tools they need” (p. 21). However, Benor’s (2010) conception is restricted to the “arsenal of distinctive resources used by a particular group” (p. 161). The repertoire approach differs theoretically from previous work in that the concept rests on markedness, rather than being a bounded set of features:

In the ethnolinguistic repertoire approach, the work of alignment and distinction is done through the variable use of what I call ‘distinctive linguistic features,’ any elements of language that are marked as distinct from language used in other groups (whether or not speakers are aware of them). (Benor, 2010, p. 160)

Repertoire thus offers an apt construct for analyzing language use, style, and identity construction in ethnic groups, including patterns of social interaction and their relationship to
language use over time. The notion is particularly well suited to addressing style and identity in immigrant and ethnic communities and multilingual environments where speakers’ linguistic resources encompass multiple languages, varieties, and code-switching practices (Benor 2010, Sharma, 2011).

In sum, stylistic practice is fundamental to the construction of individual and group identities, the development and maintenance of aggregate patterns of variation, and the relationship between language and society more broadly. Recent emphasis on style as agentive, and on variation as a resource for identity construction and display, has led to “increase[d] focus on the intra-individual patterning of variation, including how individual variants pattern across different discourse contexts; how variants co-occur in, and cohere into, individual styles, situational styles (e.g. registers), and group styles (e.g. dialects); and, crucially, how variants are used in a non-aggregate sense, in unfolding discourse” (Schilling, 2013b: 327). In the following section, I will discuss the increasingly recognized need for mixed-methods studies that integrate discourse-analytic methodology with variation as a productive approach to understanding social meaning and the sociolinguistic construction of identity in interaction.

2.4 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Since social meanings of features like those I have described above can only be discovered in context, research on language and identity is inherently interdisciplinary, incorporating insights from anthropology, discourse analysis, and psychology, among other fields. In order to provide a comprehensive account of linguistic identity construction, and to understand the stylistic use of particular linguistic variants, we need to contextualize linguistic practice in its context of utterance. In other words, we cannot limit our analyses to
decontextualized discrete features; rather, because variation is strategically used in interaction, we must examine what discursive work is being achieved (Coupland, 2001). Recent scholarship increasingly calls for the integration of discourse-analytic and variationist approaches to provide a deeper understanding of linguistic style and identity construction (Coupland, 2007, p. 4; Johnstone, 2006; Trester, 2008; also see Hay & Drager’s [2007] call for the incorporation of discourse analysis into sociophonetic studies). Discourse analysis, or the study of language above the level of discrete structural units, or “beyond the sentence” (Schiffrin, Tannen, & Hamilton, 2001, p. 1), offers a productive and essential means of understanding the relationship between linguistic form and social meaning, since these meanings are not assigned to variants a priori but constructed through interaction.

As I have discussed, speakers’ stylistic use of different variants reflects and constructs their individual and group-level identities. These linguistic acts of identity (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985) are necessarily discursive in nature. The relationship between linguistic features and social meaning is enacted through discourse as speakers draw on the linguistic resources at their disposal for purposes of self-representation and other interactional goals (for example, to create distance or affiliation). The recursive relationship between (perceived) group language behavior and individual practice informs stylistic language use, and can therefore be accessed via in-depth investigations of the discursive practices in which linguistic variables are embedded.

For example, Kiesling’s (1998) combined quantitative and qualitative work showed that -ing variation was a resource in for interactional alignment and stance-taking as speakers constructed masculine identities. Johnstone, Andrus, and Danielson’s (2006) extensive work on language, place, and mobility has demonstrated the importance of analysis of spoken discourses
as well as mediated text and cultural artifacts (e.g., historical newspaper articles, t-shirts featuring iconic local ways of speaking) in understanding the emergence of an enregistered “Pittsburghese” dialect associated with local place identity. Studies like these tend to concentrate on fine-grained analysis of naturalistic data from small speaker groups, allowing more in-depth analysis of contextualized stylistic variables. Schilling-Estes’ (2004) classic study of speakers in Robeson County, North Carolina showed that African American and Lumbee Indian interview participants style shifted to align or disalign with each other based on discourse topic. In this study, Schilling-Estes (2004) examined the co-occurrence of phonological features and discourse markers in a two-party interview. She found that the correlation of discourse patterns with African American Vernacular English features revealed different associations (“rural Southern”; “African-American”) for the same phonological variants (r-lessness; tahm for time), depending on the affiliation between speakers in general and at different moments in the interaction. The variants’ social associations drew on the specific local history of separation and segregation of the Black, white, and Lumbee Indian ethnic groups in the area, as well as reflecting more general patterns of race relations in the historic and current U.S. This study highlights the importance of discursive context in understanding social meaning: rather than a single linguistic form indexing relaxed or formal speech, Schilling-Estes (2004) found localized features to be used in conjunction with other discursive indications of (in)formality, such as discourse markers (“you know,” “I mean”; Schiffrin, 1987). Further, the identity work performed by style shifting was revealed within topics related to local and more global socio-historical contexts as these were discussed in the context of the group interview.
2.4.1 Positioning

Positioning, or the discursive presentation of a multiplicity of selves (Davies & Harré, 1990), is an important element of identity work: “the social positioning of self and other” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 586). Positioning operates on multiple levels, as speakers present themselves and others as particular kinds of people, in relationship to each other, to the interlocutor, and to broader social ideologies. Bamberg’s (1997) three-level model offers an instructive approach. Level one addresses positioning in talk, in what Gee (1990) refers to as “little-d discourse”, or “connected stretches of language that make sense” (p. 142). Level two addresses interactional positioning between speaker and audience; level three addresses the relationship between discursive identity construction and broader social constructs and ideologies. While Bamberg (1997) developed his model for narrative analysis, I extend it productively to conversational data. This is in line with Davies and Harré’s (1990) original conceptualization of positioning as related to story lines, or shared/circulating cultural tropes about social behavior (such as paternalism, or gendered expectations of good or bad behavior). Gee (1990) describes these as “big-D” Discourse, “ways of being in the world, or forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, social identities” (p. 142); other vocabulary includes Master Narratives or “culture-wide ideologies” (Tannen, 2008, p. 206); “criterial personae” (Agha, 2005, p. 49); schemata (Piaget, 1926); and topoi (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001), among other formulations.

These story lines are not limited to “story-world” narrated events, but are also referenced, negotiated, co-constructed, and extended in discursive interaction. For example, speakers can reference discourses of appropriate or transgressive behavior while positioning themselves and others as moral or immoral people in relationship to topics and other discourse
objects. On all levels, therefore, positioning contributes to discursive group and individual identity construction, since the relationship between social actors “provides [them] with the discursive or cultural resources to claim and thus attempt to create shifting ‘communities,’ identities, selves, and roles, at different levels of contrast, within a cultural field” (Irvine & Gal, 2000, p. 404).

On the discursive level, positioning contributes to identity construction by placing “we” and “they” groups in relationship to each other. This can be achieved through explicit positioning, involving direct attribution of behaviors and characteristics, or through implicit positioning, such as affective displays of surprise, for example (Georgakopoulou 2007; Sabat, 2003). This discursive self- and other-positioning constructs group identity through contrast (Irvine, 2001), affiliation, and social distance, with accompanying moral and evaluative dimensions (Davies & Harré, 1990; Du Bois, 2007). Discursive self- and other-positioning can enact interactional positioning by allowing the speaker to present him- or herself to the audience in accordance with relational goals—for example, in argumentation for a legal settlement or award, one might present oneself as deserving and wronged. Finally, discursive and interactional positioning relates to broader social constructs and ideologies; as such, positioning is a key means of identifying speaker identity vis-à-vis these broader tropes. At the same time, positioning also contributes to their potential reconfiguration.

2.4.2 Person reference

Positioning is enacted through many diverse linguistic strategies that activate or “make relevant” different aspects of ideology for purposes of self-representation (De Fina, 2013a, p. 45; Bamberg, 1997). These include discourse moves such as stancework (Du Bois, 2007) and a range of other discursive, suprasegmental, and semantic strategies or “contextualization cues”
(Gumperz, 1982). In this dissertation, I operationalize positioning using 1) person reference, with focus on pronoun usage and attributed qualities, as a means of identifying we- and they-group demarcation; and 2) stancework.

The deictic relationships on which affiliative and oppositional positioning rests can be created through discursive moves such as stance-taking, and also evoked directly through the use of person references, in particular pronominal choice. I will first discuss person reference as a linguistic mechanism for group construction and alignment. Person reference is inherent to group formation via positioning and (dis)alignment in that it is used to express relationships between individuals and groups, and attribute qualities to them. Person-reference terms include names, relational and non-relational descriptions, often-contrastive category terms (for example, mother/father), and pronouns (Stivers, Enfield, & Levinson, 2007). Grammatically, the deictic nature of personal pronouns encodes a self- and other-relationship that can be used to express relative degrees of inclusion and exclusion and distance and solidarity (“I”, “you”, “we”, etc.) (Brown & Gilman, 1960; Jakobson, 1971; Jesperson, 1924). Since personal pronouns inherently evoke relationships of distance or solidarity between the persons to whom they refer, they serve as a powerful linguistic tool through which speakers can create in- and out-groups which are attributed different qualities, enabling speakers to position themselves and others in affiliation or opposition to each other or to ideological reference points. For example, van Dijk’s (1991) study of British newspaper reporting found that the use of first- and third-person pronouns was key to the construction of exclusionary racial and cultural discourses through which immigrant or minority “they”-groups were associated with unacceptable deviance. Similarly, personal pronouns in political discourse can serve as “typical deictics for political contexts and their
categories,” invoking in-groups which are constructed and highlighted at different points in interaction (for example, “political position, alliances, solidarity, and other socio-political position(s) of the speaker … We in the West, we the people, we American citizens, we Democrats, we in the government, or indeed we the President”; van Dijk 1995, p. 6). Person reference and pronominal choice are therefore a productive means of examining speakers’ positioning via group construction and attribution of behavior and associated social qualities to themselves and others in discourse.

2.4.3 Stance

Stancework is an essential discursive mechanism in positioning, since the process of stance-taking inherently positions the speaker in relationship to “stance objects” (Du Bois, 2007). Stances are defined by Du Bois (2007) as public communicative acts expressing evaluation, which “simultaneously evaluate objects, position subjects (themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field” (p. 163). Stancework therefore both reveals and comprises speaker attitudes through the expression of evaluation, emotions, and epistemic claims towards different subjects and stance objects (Du Bois, 2007) which may or may not be physically present in the interactional context. These might include audience and/or interlocutor, narrative characters and social figures, topics, and broader cultural tropes.

Stance-taking entails both self- and other-positioning, in that the expression of speaker attitudes towards a stance object necessarily creates a relationship (whether close or distant) between the two. For example, positive evaluation of a friend’s involvement in community volunteer work positions the speaker in alignment and affiliation with the friend in terms of this behavior; disapproval of non-participation allows the speaker to distance him or herself,
positioning the two in disalignment or even opposition. This positioning inherently expresses valuation and morality (Du Bois, 2007; Davies & Harré, 1990) and in turn allows the speaker to present him or herself as a particular kind of person (for example, “good”, generous, and dedicated, or “bad”, lazy, and selfish).

Stances can be broadly categorized as expressing degrees of epistemic certainty (“commitment”), evaluative expressions (“value judgments,” “assessments,” and “attitudes”), and expressions of emotional affect (“personal feelings”) (Engelbretson, 2007, p. 17; see also Ochs, 1989). These are expressed through utterance-level discourse moves employing a wide range of linguistic forms and strategies, as summarized in an early definition from Biber and Finegan (1989): “the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message” (p. 93) (see also Jaffe, 2009; Kiesling, 2009; Kockelman, 2004; Ochs, 1996). For example, since the use of a particular modal verb or affective adjective inherently contrasts with other potential word choices and possible meanings, its use indicates the speakers’ epistemic, affective, or evaluative stance towards the stance object (e.g., “You should study more” versus “You could study more”; a “good” versus “fantastic teacher”; Du Bois, 2007).

While stancework employs a wide range of linguistic resources, particular features typical of epistemic, evaluative, and affective stances have been documented. Kärkkäinen (2006) offers a typology of linguistic forms that can indicate epistemic stancework. Following Chafe’s (1986) continuum of epistemic markers indicating degrees of certainty, she identifies adverbials (“undoubtedly, surely, maybe, probably, might, may”) as well as phrases indicating degree of speaker commitment (“I think”, “I believe”), modals expressing evidentiality and conjecture
must,” “should”), and expressions of knowledge sources (“people say”) (p. 52; also see Chafe, 1986, pp. 262-265; Kärkkäinen, 2003, 2009; Thompson & Hunston, 2000, pp. 20–21). The use of evidential adverbials and expressions is also documented by Biber and Finegan (1989) and by Conrad and Biber (2000).

Linguistic forms that express overt evaluations include “comparative adjectives, negation, and adverbs of degree” (Johnstone, 2009, p. 31; see also Thompson & Hunston, 2000, pp. 6-13). For example, describing an object as better than something else entails evaluation, as do descriptions using evaluative adjectives and adverbs of degree such as (not) very good. These can be used with evaluative “that” constructions targeting the evaluated object, for example “It is good that you study” (Hyland & Tse, 2005). Evaluative nouns such as “idiot” can also be used to express evaluation (Du Bois, 2007; Hunston & Sinclair, 2000). Finally, evaluative stance can also be expressed indirectly through speakers’ displays of affect, which demonstrate “evaluative orientations” towards stance objects (Jaffe, 2009, p. 125). Examples of linguistic features that can convey affective stance include adverbials (Engelbreton, 2007, p. 17; see also Biber & Finegan 1988, 1989; Conrad & Biber 2000; Downing, 2002) and quantifiers, as well as emphatic stress and phonological lengthening, discourse moves such as interjections and repetition, and laughter (Ochs, 1996, p. 411). For example, the intensity of the sentence “I don’t eat a lot of carbs” can be elevated through the use of emphatic stress (“I DON’T eat a lot of carbs”). This emphasis on the word “don’t” indicates to the hearer that the speaker has strong feelings towards eating carbohydrates, which (since the negation is emphasized) indicates a negative evaluation and stance towards this behavior. This positions the speaker as a non-carb-eating type of person and potentially references discourses of morality related to food, health, and body (Coupland &
Coupland, 2009). Were the utterance to be issued with laughter, an additional affective dimension would be added ("I DON’T eat a lot of carbs (laughter)"). Laughter in this context could show humor, indicating that the statement is not to be taken seriously, or serve as a mitigating strategy to soften the negative evaluation of carb-eaters so that the speaker does not seem self-righteous, in order to avoid offending others present or to build affiliation (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

This example highlights two important points. While particular linguistic forms are associated with different types of stances, utterance-level stancework is not limited to single lexico-grammatical forms, but is expressed through conjunctions of different linguistic features, discourse moves, and non-linguistic cues such as laughter. Stances must therefore be studied with an inclusive approach to structural forms and context clues that pays close attention to the discursive context.

Stance and positioning also relate to the social meaning of linguistic variables. For example, Kiesling (2009) found that stylistic use of ethnolectal variables (in particular “wogspeak”, which is thought to have originated in the Greek immigrant community in Australia) is related to interpersonal stances that align interviewees and interviewer in solidarity by shortening relational distance. Similar findings of stylistic variation used for stance-related identity work were presented in Rampton’s (2006) research on Cockney accents and Ervin-Tripp’s (2001) work on African American/white English. Importantly, Jaffe (2009) notes that this kind of stylistic work can be enacted using particular repertoire features “along a continuum of intensity and frequency”, and does not necessarily require the entire set of features in a dialect or style (p. 14). Kiesling’s (2009) understanding of stance seems broader than mine, in keeping
with Jaffe’s understanding of subject positions as stances. In this study I follow Du Bois (2007) and distinguish stance and positioning; I use the latter term to refer to intersubjective relationships, following Bamberg (1997) and Schilling-Estes (2004), among others.

Finally, while stances are enacted in discourse, stancework is intimately related to the sociocultural environment: “stances … (are) clearly hooked into wider social discourses and ideologies, or are contextualized in important ways by them” (Coupland & Coupland, 2009, p. 228). Epistemic stances rest on claims of knowledge and authority anchored in speakers’ sociocultural context (Jaffe, 2009, p. 7), while evaluative stances reference value systems grounded in this environment, making them potential “sites of political struggle and ideological contestation” (Jaffe, 2009, p. 5). These ideologies often relate to different social groups: “acts of speaking are ideologically mediated, since those acts necessarily involve the speaker’s understandings of salient social groups, activities, and practices … [in] evaluations” (Irvine, 2001, p. 24). De Fina and King (2011) found that Latino immigrant narratives reproduced United States Discourses of racial identity categories and crime. In this study, speakers distinguished between African Americans, presented as criminals and aggressors, and Latinos, who were presented as innocent (a theme echoed by speakers in Relaño Pastor and De Fina [2005]), creating an implicit binary. In contrast, speakers I interviewed for this dissertation frequently referenced both conflict and solidarity between African Americans and Latinos, constructing a race- and social-class-based binary which was positioned in opposition with the white majority. Relaño Pastor and De Fina (2005) found that immigrant women positioned themselves as agentive and positioned others as oppositional in narratives that challenge existing Discourses of immigrants as incapable and illegitimate. In their narratives, they repositioned themselves as
agentive participants in medical encounters, holding the moral high ground against their antagonists. As with sociolinguistic style, therefore, stancework and positioning both reference and potentially redefine social constructs, with long-term implications for social identity⁸. As speakers

position themselves and others as particular kinds of people … stances can build up into larger identity categories … the process of creating indexical ties of this kind is inherently ideological, creating in bottom-up fashion a set of interactional norms for particular social groups. (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 596)

### 2.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have reviewed previous research on Latino Englishes, motivated the choice of /æ/ as the variable under study in this dissertation, and discussed the importance of research on Latino English language practices for understanding language systems and substrate-origin features, phonological variation, and language and identity. I have described the reciprocal relationship between language and society and its implications for language development and identity construction, focusing on sociolinguistic variation, discourse analysis, and the methodological motivations for integrating them in this dissertation.

An integrated approach to sociolinguistic meaning is essential to understanding the relationship between patterns of variation and identity construction, with implications for macro-level language system development and widely and locally held social constructs, including ideologies about minority populations. Fought (2006) notes that contact-origin ethnolectal varieties have a special role to play in sociolinguistic research:

---

⁸ For more detail on the processes by which stances can come to transcend particular linguistic encounters, please refer to Damari (2010), Jaffe (2009), Jaworski and Thurlow (2009) and Rauniomaa (2003).
the study of emerging dialects provides us with a rare opportunity to see how elements of language in contact settings … are woven together over time to create new varieties. In particular, the varieties in question will be tied to ethnic identity, and so they have important implications for the study of language and ethnicity (p. 85)

Despite their importance, however, Latino Englishes remain understudied in comparison with African American English and other American English varieties.

The /ae/ variable presents particularly interesting research opportunities due to its diagnostic status in Latino English and non-native English, its contrasting realizations in Chicano English and general American English, and its sociolinguistic variation and potential for identity display in Chicano English (Carter, 2007; Eckert, 1996, 2008a; Fought, 2003; Roeder, 2010). While this dissertation generally focuses on /ae/, other linguistic features were taken into account in case-study qualitative analysis (chapter 5) to provide a fuller sense of the speaker’s linguistic repertoire.

Sociolinguistic variation in interaction is relevant to language system development, since social practice is a nexus through which linguistic change takes place (Eckert, 1990, 2000). Sociolinguistic variation relates both to individual identity construction and to more substantive social abstractions such as racial and ethnic identity—categories that, although open to interpretation through the changing indexical bricolage of the meaning-making process (Eckert, 1996; 2008a), nevertheless carry ideological weight that affects speakers’ lives in the social environment. The reciprocal relationship between language structures, interactional practices, and sociolinguistic attitudes and ideologies, which is mediated through discursive positioning and indexical relationships between linguistic variants and social meanings, therefore has implications for changes in language systems, including the development of contact varieties
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with substrate-origin features such as Chicano English, as well as for processes of individual- and group-level identity construction. As speakers creatively use the linguistic resources at their disposal for purposes of interactional identity work, their language practices simultaneously draw on preexisting patterns of variation and social meanings, and give rise to new patterns and associations.

The integration of discourse analysis with variation offers important insights into the process by which meaning attaches to sociolinguistic variants: discourse analysis provides a valuable method for grounding a linguistic variable’s social meaning in its discursive context, both at the interactional level and in terms of broader social ideologies. At the same time, discursively-created social meaning can impact the development of language systems via sociolinguistic variation. A key aspect of this process is the ascription of different qualities, attitudes, and behaviors to individuals and groups via self- and other-positioning, which allows speakers to present themselves and others as different “kinds of people”, in accordance with interactional goals and individual and group-level conceptions of self. Two productive ways to operationalize the positioning that encodes this self- and other-relationship are stance and person reference through pronominal choice. Both strategies position speakers in relationship to others: stance does so via expressions of emotion, evaluation, and knowledge; pronouns do so through grammatical encoding. These strategies aid in discursively constructed group formation, particularly taking the form of “we” versus “them,” which is often marked linguistically through minority language choice or through the use of non-standard features and discourse strategies such as code-switching (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982).
In sum, the relationship between symbol and signified—between language and identity—demands an integrated approach involving principled analyses of both discursive positioning and sociolinguistic variation if it is to be fully understood. This multi-faceted analytic approach is particularly important in situations of complex social and linguistic diversity, such as Washington, D.C. In the next chapter, I will discuss the data and specific analytic methodologies used in this dissertation.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I motivate and outline the study’s methodology, describe the research site and participants, review methods for data collection and processing, and explain the procedures for integrated quantitative variation and qualitative discourse analyses.

3.1 PARTICIPANTS AND RECRUITMENT

Smaller-scale studies make important contributions to sociolinguistic research, complementing and extending existing bodies of research through detailed examination of phenomena that would be missed by large-scale studies. For example, larger-scale studies have documented differences between Chicano English and general American English and identified sociolinguistic variation in Chicano English /ae/ patterns (Fought, 2003; Gordon, 2000; Roeder, 2006; Thomas, 2001). However, a more detailed level of analysis is necessary to adequately account for the role of individual speakers in variation and the specific social practices, identity considerations, interactional factors, and ideologies that may influence these patterns (Eckert, 1996). Smaller studies thus productively complement the backdrop of research on sociolinguistic behavior that larger studies provide, contributing to a deeper sociolinguistic understanding and indicating directions for future research.

This dissertation examines 12 adult first- and second-generation Latino immigrants currently residing in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Participants were current residents of Columbia Heights in Washington, D.C.; Montgomery County, Maryland, along the D.C. border; and the Seven Corners area of Fairfax County in northern Virginia, which is also near the
city. First-generation speakers are defined as having been born outside the United States, and second-generation as having been born in the United States and having at least one non-native-born parent (Fry & Passel, 2009). As described in chapter 1, first-generation participants all moved to the D.C. area by age 15, and can thus be considered pre-adolescent or 1.5 generation immigrants. This population was selected to control for native English proficiency (Santa Ana, 1993), in contrast to adult first-generation immigrants who typically speak English as a second language. The speakers in the study are all fluent native (or near-native) speakers of English, and share common bilingual experiences and a baseline of exposure to local D.C. language varieties and practices. However, the difference in immigrant generation potentially created different social experiences and associations with language and identity, particularly in terms of orientation to “American”, “Latino”, or home-country identity (Pew Research Center, 2013a; for more details, see section 3.5.6 below).

Participants’ ages range from 18-50 years old; the shortest period of D.C. residency for first-generation speakers is 8 years, and the longest is 35 years; second-generation speakers have lived in D.C. for the majority of their lives. All have been D.C. residents since age 15 or earlier. These immigration and residency criteria were intended to constrain social and linguistic factors such as the age of onset of speakers’ English acquisition and exposure to D.C. area dialect(s). It is generally accepted that adolescence (varyingly delimited between 12-15 years of age) in some sense constrains the potential for native-like second-language or second-dialect phonological acquisition (Chambers, 1992; Lenneberg, 1967; Newport, 1990; Patowski, 1990; Seliger, Krashen, & Ladefoged, 1975). However, dialect features can continue to “solidify” under social (peer-group) influence during the teenage years (Labov, 1972b). Eckert (1988) further asserts
that adolescence, socially defined as the “pre-adult” period between childhood and adulthood—which in the United States continues through the secondary education period to the liminal age of 18—is associated with “development of patterns of linguistic variation [as part of a] system of social differentiation” (p. 187). Finally, research also shows that native-like proficiency can be found in post-adolescent speakers, with speaker motivation and language education as possible influencing factors (Birdsong, 2007; Bongaerts, 1999; Fix, 2013). This summary indicates the ongoing linguistic debate surrounding adolescence; however, as previously stated, in this study I focused on speakers who were born in the United States or arrived in D.C. before age 15 to establish a baseline of native English proficiency and exposure to D.C. language varieties.

Equal numbers of men and women, and first- and second-generation immigrants, were included in the data set. Participants’ levels of educational attainment at time of interview ranged from high school (12th grade) to graduate (M.A.) education. Social class, coded following accepted sociolinguistic and sociological factors (Ash, 2013; Labov, 1966), was identified as working or middle class (see section 3.5.5 below for more detail). Participants’ backgrounds encompass a range of (their own or their parents’) national origins in order to represent the D.C. Latino community as broadly as possible. I did not strive for a numerically representative sample of national origins, since participants were recruited through word of mouth in local social networks and through contacts in community organizations such as activist groups, youth theater programs, and community colleges. Interviews were conducted in quiet locations such as public libraries, unused work spaces, libraries, or in individuals’ homes. I usually asked participants to suggest interview sites to ensure they would feel most comfortable when we met.
All speakers self-identify as bilingual and regularly use English and Spanish in a range of daily interactions. Typically, their first language was Spanish, with English acquired in school; however, two speakers (Gracia and Marcos) identified English as their first productive languages, although both were exposed to Spanish and English in early childhood. Bilingual practices were typically related to social domains (Fishman, 1972) and social networks. Spanish was used in the home and with parents and older relatives. Both English and Spanish were used with Latino friends, and both languages were used in the workplace, depending on job and interactants. For example, service encounters with older Latino customers were often conducted in Spanish, but speakers did not use Spanish in English-monolingual, white-collar occupations. Despite these individual differences in use, all participants were fluent speakers of both languages, with meaningful educational experiences in the U.S. school system and varying levels of Spanish formal education.

Table 1. Participant information at time of interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Immigrant generation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>National origin</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College or higher</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viviana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candida</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>College or higher</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>College or higher</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Venezuela/Cuba</td>
<td>D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>College or higher</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>El Salvador/Guatemala</td>
<td>D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Mexico/El Salvador</td>
<td>D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I now turn to a discussion of the participants. I begin with first-generation immigrants and
discuss first women and then men. Diana, Viviana, Carolina, and Celia are first-generation
immigrants. Diana is a first-generation Paraguayan immigrant in her twenties. She uses Spanish
with her parents and when speaking with family in Paraguay, and Spanish and Guaraní with
older relatives. She uses Spanish and English with siblings, with her friends, who are primarily
Latino, and with her boyfriend, a first-generation Honduran immigrant. She maintains active
families ties in Paraguay and identifies strongly as Latina, for example stating that she feels
comfortable around Latinos due to shared language, values, culture, and interests, such as music
and dance, and disdaining her younger sister and others for being “Americanized”, using these
dimensions as examples. Her mother works in domestic service and is the primary breadwinner
since her father retired. Diana uses English and Spanish in her work as a nanny and at a bilingual
school. She attends community college and, at the time of our interview, had been accepted to a
public 4-year university. She resides in the suburbs. I interviewed Diana on the community
college campus.

Viviana is a first-generation Guatemalan immigrant in her twenties. She uses Spanish
with her parents and when speaking with family in Guatemala, and Spanish, English, and
Spanglish with siblings and with her friends, whom she identifies as primarily Latino. She
identifies strongly as Latina and is passionate about social work and immigration rights. Her
parents have working-class jobs; her father was the primary breadwinner prior to returning to
Guatemala, and works in seasonal labor. At the time of our interview, she was attending a
community college, where she was active in Latino youth organizations, and she resided in the
suburbs. I interviewed Viviana on the community college campus.
Carolina is a first-generation immigrant from Bolivia in her twenties. She uses Spanish at home with her parents and when visiting relatives in Bolivia and reports using mixed English and Spanish language practices, popularly referred to as “Spanglish,” with her sibling, and English with her friends. She identifies as Latina and maintains active contact with family in Bolivia, but stated that she experiences tension with behavioral expectations in U.S. Latino and traditional Bolivian culture, such as “partying” norms and gender roles. She describes her friend group as international and diverse. At the time of our interview, she was attending a public university and used English and Spanish at her job in a campus research center. Her parents are well-educated and come from an upper-class background in Bolivia\(^b\), and her father, the primary breadwinner, works in a professional job at an international organization. She resides in the suburbs. I interviewed Carolina on a university campus.

Celia is a first-generation immigrant from Bolivia in her forties. She was raised in a Spanish-speaking household and now uses Spanish and English with her oldest daughter, English with her younger sons, Spanish and English socially, and English at work as an at-home nurse’s aide. Her family was middle-class with a professionally-employed primary breadwinner in Bolivia, but their circumstances were reduced upon immigrating to the United States. Celia socializes with a diverse friend group including Latinos she has known since high school. She identifies as Latina and is proud of Bolivian culture, but due to maternal protectiveness of her children from gangs, she also has a strongly “pro-American” attitude in line with conservative

---

\(^b\) I included home-country social class information based on participants’ own descriptions in first-generation participants’ biographies where possible to provide more complete background information. Speaking very generally, much of Latin America historically had an essentially dual class system in which a hereditary elite benefited from colonial social structure and social/racial hierarchies (Beals, 1953). There has been an increase in the middle classes in recent decades (Ferreira et al., 2013); however, one primary difference between the middle and upper classes persists in terms of college education (Torche and López-Calva, 2011).
discourses about immigration and crime (Santa Ana, 2002). She has completed certification as a vocational health aide and struggles financially as a single parent. She resides in the suburbs. I interviewed Celia at a public library.

I now turn to male first-generation immigrants: Jacobo, Alonso, and Emanuel. Jacobo is a first-generation Colombian immigrant in his twenties who identifies strongly as Latino. He uses Spanish at home and with family, and Spanish and English with his mostly-Latino friend group. His mother, the primary breadwinner, has little education and has working-class jobs. He attends a community college, where he is active in Latino youth organizations, and he resides in the suburbs. I interviewed Jacobo on the community college campus.

Alonso is a first-generation Salvadoran immigrant in his late teens. He identifies as Latino and uses Spanish with family and Spanish and English with friends, who are primarily Latino, and in a variety of service jobs. He considers Spanish to be an important part of his Latino culture, and as the “man of the family,” he sees himself as instrumental in making sure his younger siblings maintain the language. His mother is the primary breadwinner and does working-class jobs. At time of interview, he resided in the suburbs, but originally lived in the city and has since moved back. Alonso attends community college and he involved in a Latino community arts organization, where I interviewed him.

Emanuel is a first-generation Salvadoran immigrant in his 40s. He uses Spanish and English with family, with his European-American wife, with a diverse friend group, and at work in a Latino community organization. He expresses strong Latino identity and commitment to Latino and Salvadoran culture, which he continually engages with and problematizes through performance art, in which bilingualism plays an important part. His family was middle-class in
El Salvador but experienced reduced circumstances upon immigrating to the United States. He has a high school education. His wife, the principal breadwinner, is professionally employed. He resides in D.C. I interviewed Emanuel at the Latino community organization where he works and conducted follow-up interviews which were used for ethnography and metacommentary.

I now describe the second-generation participants: Candida, Gracia, Alonso, Hector, and Emanuel. Candida is a second-generation Mexican American in her late teens (19 years old). She uses Spanish with her parents and when speaking with family in Mexico, and English and Spanish with siblings, U.S. relatives, and friends, many of whom are Latino. Candida identifies as Latina but her relationship with this identity is complicated: she expressed tension between traditional notions of Latino identity and her own practices and preferences, for example stating that she is a “bad Latina” due to her lack of expertise with certain cultural practices, such as cooking traditional foods, and her interest in other cultures (for example, Japan and England). Her parents have little formal education; her mother did not have the chance to complete schooling in Mexico and had working-class jobs from an early age. Candida attended community college and, at the time of our interview, had just been accepted to a public 4-year university. She resides in the suburbs. I interviewed Candida on the community college campus and also met with her at a coffee shop to talk about her self-recordings.

Gracia is a second-generation Salvadoran American in her twenties. She uses Spanish and English with her parents, Spanish with relatives in El Salvador, and English with her friends, whom she describes as non-Latino and diverse. Her first productive language was English, although she was exposed to both languages since early childhood and is fluently bilingual. Her parents are educated, from an upper-class background in El Salvador, and work in professional
jobs. She identifies as Latina but recognizes that her family’s experience is very different from that experienced by most Salvadorans and immigrants, which led to her interest in advocacy and public policy. She attends a private university and uses English and Spanish in a variety of internships and jobs. She resides in the suburbs. I interviewed Gracia on a university campus.

Felix is a second-generation Cuban-Venezuelan American in his twenties. He uses Spanish with his parents, who enforce a “Spanish-only” policy at home, and with Cuban relatives and when traveling in Latin America. He uses English with siblings outside of the home and with his diverse, non-Latino friend group. He has little overt interest in Latino identity and is described as the “American son.” Nonetheless, he sees Spanish as an important skill for his children to learn, although he plans to “outsource” language teaching to schools and tutors. He attends a private university and has a strong interest in business. His parents are educated and work in professional jobs. He resides in the suburbs. I interviewed Felix on a university campus.

Hector is a second-generation Salvadoran-Guatemalan American in his thirties. He identifies as Latino and uses Spanish with family, Spanish and English with family and friends, and English at work. He is also involved in Latino music and community outreach, and he expresses strong affiliation with Latino culture and identity, which he describes with both pride and insecurity. While older family members held working-class jobs and were not highly educated, he holds a graduate degree and is professionally employed. He resides in D.C. I interviewed Hector at the community organization where he volunteers and held follow-up meetings about the interview and self-recordings with him at public events and at mutual acquaintances’ homes.
Marcos is a second-generation Salvadoran-Mexican American in his thirties. He uses Spanish and English with family, English with his European-American wife, and Spanish and English with his young son, whom he hopes will also be bilingual. His first productive language was English, although he was exposed to both languages since early childhood, was educated for a year in El Salvador, and is fluently bilingual. Marcos identifies as Latino and expressed a strong Washingtonian identity, and is proud of his multilingualism and familiarity with different English and Spanish dialects. He is professionally employed and uses English at work. He has a high school education. He resides in D.C. I interviewed Marcos in his home and conducted a follow-up interview in his home which was used for ethnography and metacommentary.

3.2 Data

3.2.1 Sociolinguistic interviews

Data for this study consist of sociolinguistic interviews and participant self-recordings in a range of social contexts. Sociolinguistic interviews have traditionally been used as a means of gathering naturalistic speech data (Labov, 1963, 1972a; Schilling, 2013a; Schilling-Estes, 1998, 2004; Schilling-Estes & Wolfram, 1999). While early sociolinguistic interviews assumed that unselfconscious speech was likely to yield the less standard features associated with a speaker’s “vernacular” (Labov, 1972a), more recent research on language and identity casts doubt on the assumption that a single, identifiable language variety can represent someone’s “true” speech since all speakers have different styles at their disposal, which they use fluidly to achieve interactional work in different contexts. However, the sociolinguistic interview remains a productive and important source of linguistic data in which speakers display their identities and perform different speech styles (Eckert, 2000; Schilling, 2013a). For example, Schilling-Estes’
(2004) study of African American English features and discourse markers showed that speakers strategically used vernacular forms as they positioned themselves as different kinds of people within a sociolinguistic interview. While sociolinguistic interviews represent a particular interactional genre, they are like other speech contexts in that speakers react to and shape the speech event, interlocutor, and topic, and they position themselves interactionally in relation to these factors (Bell, 1984; Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Schilling, 2013a; Schilling-Estes, 2004; Wolfson, 1976). The myth of the vernacular therefore ceases to present a methodological dilemma in sociolinguistic interviews if one accepts the inherent performativity of language (Schilling-Estes, 1998), recognizing that speakers discursively present themselves relative to external factors such as topic, interactional context, and audience, as well as internal factors that draw on social attitudes such as positioning and stancework (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Du Bois, 2007; Kiesling, 2005). These elements of linguistic communication are as relevant in an interview context as they are in any other setting, and they may be highlighted and foregrounded in particular ways in a sociolinguistic interview.

I conducted twenty-four interviews using a Sony PCM-M10 digital recorder with a 44 kHz sampling rate (24-bit depth). Of these, twelve interviews were selected based on speakers’ residency and age of arrival criteria described in section 3.1 These interviews represent the speech of 6 men and 6 women; interviews also represent equal numbers of first- and second-generation immigrants. These interviews yielded approximately 30 hours of data with an average length of 1-1.5 hours and an estimated 16,000 /ae/ tokens (coding methods described in the section to follow). Interviews were conversational and aimed to elicit conversational speech about speakers’ personal experiences and opinions about language and cultural contact,
immigration, and identity. The question modules were loosely oriented around the topics of immigration, daily life in D.C., language attitudes and language use, and popular perceptions of Latinos (Appendix A). Modules were used to scaffold the conversation as necessary, but questions were not read from a script. Questions addressing explicit linguistic ideology and stereotyping were asked at the end of interviews so as not to create undue self-consciousness.

Interviews were conducted primarily in English, though participants were assured that they were free to code-switch at will. As part of the recruitment and interview process, I also observed and took field notes in participants’ homes, schools, and community organizations as a way of more fully understanding their social environments outside of the interview context. My access to participants’ various social spheres varied depending on social networks, namely my own relationship with participants and how they were recruited. For example, I was able to observe some participants in their homes and in a range of casual social situations due to personal relationships with them and with others in their social networks. I also observed the Latino Student Organization at a community college as part of recruitment. This type of observation gave me insight into participants’ personalities, families, friends, and identity orientations, allowing a more nuanced understanding of their social contexts and motivations.

The tenor of interviews was relaxed. I conducted interviews as much as possible in familiar environments (schools, community organizations, homes) or at other locations suggested by participants. I knew several participants through common social networks; others heard of me through friends or acquaintances. Participants seemed to view me as a student researcher who was interested in their personal experiences, and were thus eager to help me with my studies. They were also eager to tell me about the D.C. area, which was still fairly new to me. My
personal background as a second-generation immigrant with minority race status, Spanish fluency and experience in Latin America, and upbringing in a Latino-influenced cultural area (the southwest United States) may have provided some common ground between me and my participants, and may have contributed to participants’ willingness to share personal experiences and stories. For example, although my family is from Asia, not Latin America, we were able to compare our personal experiences of immigration’s effect on families and identity, and speakers trusted that I had some familiarity with Latino cultures and understood references to cultural practices and shared referents to themes such as the U.S.-Mexico border crossing. They also felt comfortable volunteering information I had not solicited, relating the difficulty and relief involved in obtaining legal residency status, for example. In general, my participants knew me primarily in the interviewer role and saw me as a relative outsider, but our relationships were solidary and affiliative.

3.2.2 Self-recordings

Sociolinguistic interviews provide a rich source of speech data. However, since interviews alone may be inadequate to capture the range of styles available in bilingual and bidialectal settings (Sharma, 2011), I complement them with participant self-recordings. Detailed and well-regarded research using this methodology shows that self-recorded data provides an in-depth look at an individual’s language use in a variety of social settings (Podesva, 2007; Sharma, 2011; Tannen, 2004). This allows for a more complete picture of the way in which a particular linguistic variable may serve as a stylistic resource for identity construction.

I did not ask questions about residency status, although many participants referred to it as part of their thoughts on immigration.
The second phase of data collection was self-recorded data speech data from a variety of daily settings. A subset of interview participants was asked to record their conversations in different ordinary daily settings, thereby documenting their speech patterns in multiple interactional contexts. Two interviewees agreed, producing approximately 5 hours of recorded data while at work and with friends. Both self-recorders were second-generation immigrants, one man and one woman. Participants recorded themselves using a Sony PCM-M10 digital recorder pre-set to a 48 kHz sampling rate (24-bit depth) and an external Audio-Technica AT831b Lavalier lapel microphone. Participants were instructed to record for at least 30 minutes at a time “in order to reduce awareness of the self-recording situation” (Sharma, 2011, p. 469), a practice also common in sociolinguistic interviews with the same motivation. Participants were instructed to record themselves in “as wide a variety of settings as possible, but only in situations in which [they] and [their] interlocutors would feel comfortable being recorded” (Podesva, 2007, p. 483). Participants were instructed to obtain verbal consent before self-recording using a verbal script, and not to record persons younger than 18 years of age. I held follow-up conversations with self-recorders to obtain their feedback on the recording situations. Several recordings were unusable due to environmental interference (background noise, music, etc.). This led to the selection of a single speaker (Candida) for analysis, based on usable data.

It should be noted that while participants were asked to self-record in different situations, including (if possible) at work, at home, and with friends, strict control of these parameters was not possible under self-recording conditions, nor was comparison of self-recorders in the “same” contexts the motivation for this data collection. Rather, the ultimate goal of self-recordings was to gather naturalistic data of participants’ speech performance in a range of non-interview
contexts in order to examine more comprehensively how the speech of particular individuals varies in regard to variable realization. Self-recorded speech was then compared to the same individuals’ speech patterns as manifested in the sociolinguistic interviews, providing an in-depth look at usage patterns and the possible social meanings attached to the variable.

3.3 Coding the Variable

Data were transcribed using ELAN software (Wittenburg, Brugman, Russel, Klassmann, & Sloetjes, 2006). Words and vowel tokens were identified through forced alignment using the Forced Alignment and Vowel Extraction (FAVE) suite (Rosenfelder, Fruehwald, Evanini, & Yuan, 2011). FAVE uses Python CGI scripts to automatically segment recordings by aligning words from the input transcript with the audio signal, and to isolate and label vowel tokens using the Carnegie Mellon University (CMU) Pronouncing Dictionary. Computational methods to extract formant measurements are also a valuable advantage when processing large quantities of data: for example, a typical interview from my corpus yields 1,000 usable data points, giving a projected total of 16,000 /ae/ tokens from interview data alone. Automatic vowel extraction also has the advantage of measuring formants based on consistent mathematically calculated intervals, rather than relying on researcher judgments (Thomas, 2011, p. 152). I used auditory and acoustic phonetic analysis in Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2013) to manually check each automatically segmented vowel token for accuracy. Based on these labeled intervals, FAVE was then used to automatically extract and measure F1 and F2 values from each vowel token of longer than .05 milliseconds. Measurements were taken at the first one-third point of the vowel’s duration, the most effective way of measuring vowel formants in automated vowel extraction (Evanini, 2009, pp. 65-66).
FAVE extraction procedures use linear predictive coding (LPC) formant analysis, which extracts formants from the speech signal, allowing their values to be measured independent of the rest of the speech signal (residue). For each vowel token in the data set, FAVE compares a set of measurements with prior quantitative findings from the Atlas of North American English (ANAE), then selects the vowel measurement with the smallest Mahalanobis\(^1\) distance from the ANAE priors for output (Fruehwald, 2013, pp. 44-46; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006). These measurements are provided in raw form and also normalized using the well-respected Lobanov (1971) z-transformation method, which allows for meaningful phonetic comparison across individual speakers. This normalization method is consistently high-performing in terms of “eliminating variation caused by physiological differences among speakers; preserving sociolinguistic/dialectal/cross-linguistic differences in vowel quality; [and] preserving phonological distinctions among vowels (Adank, Smits, & Van Hout, 2004; Thomas, 2011, p. 161), goals of central importance to sociolinguistics and sociophonetics. The Lobanov method was also used productively by Roeder (2010) in her study of the Chicano English /ae/ vowel in Michigan.

FAVE-extracted vowel measurements were output to a text file to be used for statistical analysis and vowel plotting. Vowel space charts were generated using /ae/ formant measurements and 10 measurements apiece for the anchor vowels /i ɛ a u/. The set of /ae/ tokens was checked for outliers, which were re-measured for accuracy using a Praat script and manually checked. Vowel tokens preceded by /r w y/ (as in “grass,” “wack,” “yeah”) or followed by /l r/ (e.g. “rally,” “marry) were excluded due to the influence of these liquids on vowel formants.

\(^1\) A statistical measure used to describe the relative difference between points in different data sets (Mahalanobis, 1936).
Only tokens that occur in stressed syllables were included in the data set. For words with strong (stressed) and weak (unstressed) realizations, such as the verb “to have” in its main and auxiliary forms, only the strong realizations were included in the data (Ortiz Lira, 2008). Tokens preceding velar nasals (“bang”) were excluded from statistical analysis following Roeder (2009) in order to focus on nasality effects, since velar realizations strongly condition /ae/ raising.

3.4 QUANTITATIVE PROCEDURES

I used inter-speaker analysis to address /ae/ variation across individual speakers and account for linguistic conditioning by preceding and following phonetic environment, and social-category distribution such as gender, education level, and immigrant generation. I also used intra-speaker variation analysis to address stylistic patterning of /ae/ variation within a subset of individuals. In sociolinguistic research, it is important to consider linguistic conditioning factors in order to establish a baseline of varietal behavior, in the case of this study affirming that speakers are speaking native English, and in order to distinguish between linguistically- and socially-conditioned variation. Results were considered to be significant at p-values of less than 0.05 (indicating that the correlation between an independent factor and the dependent variable is unlikely to be random, at a significance threshold of 95%).

All statistical analysis was performed using mixed-effects regression modeling in the Rbrul statistical package (Johnson, 2012). Rbrul offers an advantage over more traditional variation-analysis programs such as Varbrul for my field data. In addition to “fixed effect” independent variables such as gender, Rbrul’s mixed effects modeling can also account for interdependency between external factors (for example, an interdependent gender and ethnicity effect). Rbrul can address continuous variables, which allows more nuanced analysis of vowels.
It can also accommodate unequal numbers of tokens across interviews, which allows for comprehensive analysis of tokens within a given recording, providing a fuller picture of variation in interaction throughout sociolinguistic interviews and self-recordings. Finally, mixed effects regression analysis has an advantage over purely logistic modeling in that it can account for “random effects,” such as speaker and lexical item, in which “some individuals might favor a linguistic outcome while others might disfavor it, over and above (or ‘under and below’) what their gender, age, social class, etc. would predict” (Johnson, 2009, p. 365). This greater degree of specificity, however, does come with an increased possibility of underestimating the predictive strength of a fixed effect. This increases the interpretive power of statistically-significant findings, but also highlights the importance of supplementing analysis with other methods of identifying and accounting for variable patterning, such as qualitative analysis of token distribution within the data to account for patterns not captured through statistical analysis.

I applied mixed-effects regression analysis to test the effects of preceding phonetic environment, following phonetic environment, and social factors on the dependent variables F1 (corresponding to /ae/ raising and lowering) and F2 (corresponding to /ae/ fronting and backing). I first tested the effects of preceding phonetic environment, following phonetic environment, and social factors on F1 values in a single step-up step-down run that also tested for interactions between factor groups such as age and sex. In step-up regression modeling, one factor is added at a time to find the best-fit model; similarly, in step-down analysis factors are subtracted one at a time to find the best-fit model. A step-up and step-down run performs both step-up and step-down runs and converges on the model which is selected as best-fit in both. I then repeated the procedure to test all factors and interactions against F2.
I followed Roeder’s (2009) coding of voicing/manner and place of articulation, which I will explain in detail in the section to follow. While this decision led to collinearity between linguistic conditioning environments, for example preceding voicing/manner and preceding place of articulation, I made this decision in order to allow for comparison with Roeder’s (2009) comparison of naturalistic interview data and lab phonology (Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Stevens & House, 1963). It should be noted that collinearity is a normal phenomenon which can be effectively addressed, while maintaining the advantages of the coding schema and comprehensive, naturalistic data sets. Collinearity is a mathematical phenomenon that occurs when one independent factor is predictive of another independent factor, as is often the case in natural data sets such as those derived from complete recordings of sociolinguistic interviews. Collinearity does not affect the predictive power of statistical analysis in terms of factor significance results but can affect the order of coefficients. This problem is effectively addressed by testing collinear factors separately, as in Drummond (2010), and by comparing significance results and coefficient rankings from these tests. Where collinearity between linguistic factors was observed, I accordingly tested the collinear linguistic factors in separate step-up and step-down runs against all other factors, and found consistent results between modeling runs in both factor significance and coefficient rankings.
3.5 **INTER-SPEAKER ANALYSIS**

3.5.1 **Independent variables**

Independent linguistic factors were preceding and following phonetic environment by voicing/manner and by place of articulation, following Roeder (2009).k Place of articulation was coded as velar (for example, “cat” for preceding phonetic environment and “hack” for following environment); apical (“tap”, “dad”, “sass”); labial (“pat”, “happy”); /h/ or pause (“hat”, “apple”); or liquid apical (“lap”). Liquid apicals were excluded from following phonetic environment, and neither /h/ nor pause was found. Voicing/manner of articulation was coded as nasal (“nanny”, “ma’am”); voiceless stop (“tack”, “cap”); voiced stop (“dad”, “gag”); voiceless fricative (“sat”, “pass”); voiced fricative (strong forms of “that”l, “jazz”); /h/ or pause; and liquid; for following phonetic environment, liquids were excluded as described above, and /h/ or pause was not found. Independent social factors were speaker sex, age, level of educational achievement, immigrant generation, and country of (own or parental) origin. Speaker and word were included as random effects.

3.5.2 **Sex**

Sex is a classic sociolinguistic variable with general patterns in regards to language variation and change. It is well documented that women lead linguistic change; for example, women were the earliest adopters of the Northern Cities shift (Labov, 1994). Further, in what Labov (1990) calls the “gender paradox”, women, particularly young women, are more likely to

---

k In Roeder’s (2009) examination of Latinos in the Inland North, the phonetic environment coding she uses is well-accepted (e.g., Labov, 1994) but goes beyond previous research by examining place of articulation and voicing/manner of articulation separately. The linguistic conditioning effects she found are not specific to the Northern Cities vowel system but may rather be universals of coarticulation and are upheld by laboratory phonology (Roeder, 2009).

l The accented determiner or “strong form” of “that” was included in this study; the complementizer and relative pronoun “weak forms” were excluded (Ortiz Lira, 2008).
lead in frequency of use of features assigned overt social prestige, which are often associated with standard or majority-group language, but are also more likely to lead in adoption of innovative linguistic forms which are “below the level of consciousness” in the sense that speakers are not aware of their difference from other forms (Labov, 1990, 1994). Labov (1966) found that women displayed prestige-related self-corrects to New York r-lessness (“New Yawk”) by social class, indicating that their linguistic behavior was sensitive to ideologies of linguistic correctness. Similarly, women’s use of innovative, socially unmarked features potentially relates to a lack of social stigma (Maclagan, Gordon, & Lewis, 1999). In contrast, men tend to be less quick to adopt linguistic innovation, and to conserve “vernacular” or ethnolectal features, a pattern which potentially relates to covert prestige associations (Labov, 1990, 1994). This can also contribute to sound change, as in Labov’s (1963) finding that men in Martha’s Vineyard were reverting to older phonological forms, potentially in response to changes in the social environment that contributed to a strong sense of local identity. Similar patterns were observed in Roeder’s (2010) work on Chicano English, where she found that young women led in assimilation to local, Northern Cities-shifted “majority-group” /ae/ norms, and middle-aged men preserved the low, backed Chicano English patterns (also see Labov, 1972a; Milroy & Milroy, 1978).

For the purposes of this study, I do not delve into the relationship between biological sex and gender, but it should be acknowledged that sex, as with any social category, is not isolated but intersects with other social categories (for example, age) that reflect not inherent truths but common social experiences. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) argued strongly that gender must be understood in the context of its meaning and construction in local speech contexts,
challenging “common assumptions … that gender can be isolated from other aspects of social identity and relations” (p. 462). Further, explanations based on prestige and stigma alone are partial. Social class and individual variation matter, as Eckert (1990; 1996) convincingly demonstrated in her study of “iconic” female teenagers’ use of local features to construct different rebellious social personae. Moore and Podesva (2009) similarly demonstrated variation in teenage girls’ use of the tag-question “innit,” which carried both stigma and local prestige, based on their social groups and orientations to “rebel” or “nice girl” identities. In terms of emergent ethnic English varieties specifically, Sharma (2011) uncovered sex- and age-related patterns in Indian English phonological features (retroflex /t/, known as “buɖ-buɖ speech”), which related to the community’s history of separation, acceptance, and contact with non-Asian Britons. On a broad level, however, these sociolinguistic sex patterns apply perhaps because of strong social ideologies that correlate gender with sex, thus impacting socialization practices that include language (Cheshire, 2002). Labov’s principles generally seem to apply across a number of studies, suggesting that women occupy a privileged place on the leading edge of sound changes, possibly due to higher motivation than men for stylistic linguistic practice based on gender-based expectations of appropriate social behavior such as sounding “nice” in different encounters.\(^m\)

3.5.3 Age

Age is another classic sociolinguistic factor. Age-related patterns in sociolinguistics are well-documented: adolescents often use lower-prestige language forms which are typically more innovative and often stigmatized; middle-aged people tend to use more general or standard

---

\(^m\) See Eckert (1996) for a detailed discussion of the social factors that may highlight stylistic linguistic practices, such as the need for self-expression and competition as adolescents, particularly young women, negotiate their identities for social prestige in the “heterosexual marketplace.”
prestige forms, and older people tend to use older and less-prestigious forms (Cheshire, 2005; Downes, 1998).

Age relates to speakers’ social context, including historical circumstances, education, employment patterns, social contacts, and identity (Dubois & Horvath, 1999; Labov, 1963; Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Sharma, 2011). For example, in research on minority communities, Dubois and Horvath (1999) and Sharma (2011) found that age-related variation was connected to different social experiences based in the current and historical social environment, including gender-related majority-group contact related to work and education. Similar patterns could shed light on Roeder’s (2006) findings that young Mexican American women assimilate to majority-group /æ/ realizations, while the Chicano English variant was conserved by middle-aged men. Similarly, Rickford (1999) found that younger African Americans used more African American English features than middle-aged or older speakers, which may be associated with stronger ethnic identity related to generational housing changes that created race-based urban segregation. Finally, recent studies of identity have shown that younger speakers in multiethnic situations have a tendency towards stylistic performance using multilingual repertoires (Auer & Dirim, 2003; Rampton, 1995, 2005). While these studies support Fought’s assertion that “age plays a key role in the construction of ethnic group membership” (2011, p. 247), it remains relatively understudied in investigations of ethnic English varieties. In research on western urbanized societies, chronological age cohorts are typically used in research as a quantifiable proxy for “social age” or “contextual age” based on assumed commonalities in life stages and events (Cheshire, 2005; Coupland, 1997; Eckert, 1997; Labov, 2001a). For example, Labov (2001a) groups life stages to capture “the changing social
relations across speakers’ life histories that affect their acquisition and use of linguistic norms and their ability to put them into practice” (p. 101). Cheshire (2005) summarizes these stages as follows:

alignment to the preadolescent peer group (ages 8-9), membership in the pre-adolescent peer group (10-12), involvement in heterosexual relations and the adolescent group (13-16), completion of secondary schooling and orientation to the wider world of work and/or college (17-19), the beginning of regular employment and family life (20-29), full engagement in the work force and family responsibilities (30-59), and retirement (60s).

(p. 1559)

These stages are complicated in immigrant situations, where language background and social experience do not necessarily align with age: for example, while the “first-generation” of non-native born immigrants is often also the oldest generation (Cheshire, 2005), in situations of continuous immigration this is not necessarily the case. These labels also necessarily subsume individual experiences into category groupings, as Cheshire (2005) and others have observed. However, age remains a productive tool for approaching social aspects of variation, and provides a practical means of comparison with previous research.

In my data, I established age cohorts following Labov (2001) with the difference that what he called “the main extent of adult life” (Labov, 2001), the working period from 30-59 years of age, was further divided by decades for a more detailed level of analysis. The youngest cohort in the study consists of 18-20 year olds and, as Cheshire (2005) observes, they are in a state of personal transition and potential orientation to different professional and educational norms. Linguistically, this group might be predicted to be the most innovative and creative, whether in terms of assimilation to majority group patterns or, conversely, in stylistic use of ethnic-associated variables. Further, this cohort is very salient in youth-centric American culture
(Ota, Harwood, Williams & Takai, 2000), which might reinforce age-related language practices related to youth identity. The next cohort, 21-30 years of age, is at the start of their work lives. (None of my participants in this age range had children.) Those aged 31-40 are in the thick of professional and family life and thus might be expected to favor more prestige forms and less ethnolectal speech. A similar prediction might be made for the oldest cohort of speakers, who are aged 41-50 and not yet retired. As I have discussed, Roeder (2006) showed that middle-aged speakers were conservative in their use of Chicano English /ae/. The study’s relatively young participants are a factor of D.C.’s Latino immigrant history and my selection criteria. Since the bulk of the area’s Latino immigration came after 1980, and since I interviewed speakers who have lived in D.C. since before age 15, the oldest possible participant age in this study was 50.

3.5.4 Education

Another potentially significant factor in conditioning variation is the speaker’s level of education. Higher levels of education typically correlate with less use of non-standard features (Silver & Lwin, 2013). Schools are an important site where children have access to general American English varieties through teachers and (depending on the school) peers, potentially acquire features of these varieties, and internalize their associations with correctness, formality, and particular types of encounter. For example, Ervin-Tripp (1973) found that African-American children used more standard than African American English features when role-playing teachers. More recently, Prichard and Tamminga’s (2012) study of Philadelphia vowels showed that attendance at nationally-prestigious universities with large non-local student populations significantly correlated with a shift away from use of the mid-Atlantic short-a split I described above, while students who attended less-prestigious local universities or had lower levels of educational attainment did not show this shift. Interestingly, in addition to reduction of these
features, speakers were also observed to be accommodating to non-local norms by adding new, non-local variants to their repertoires, a result similar to Bigham’s (2010) finding on accommodation to the Northern Cities Shift by mid-Atlantic English speakers in Illinois. These findings indicate that vowel variation can be sensitive to social factors even after adolescence, and that higher education and social awareness can affect vowel variation, particularly for features associated with different locales and speaker groups.

I grouped participants based on their highest ultimate level of education at the time of interview. Groupings were high school, community college, and college or above. To avoid single-speaker categories, vocational training was grouped with community college and undergraduate and graduate degrees were combined.

3.5.5 Social class

Social class is another classic sociolinguistic variable (Ash, 2013). It resembles socioeconomic status in that it is often determined in the social sciences based on measurable factors such as education, income, and occupation. However, social class adds the dimension of social valuation and “privilege, power, and control” (American Psychological Association, 2015) to the question of access to material resources, and thus brings the question of social experiences and identity into play.

In sociolinguistics, Labov (1966) found that middle-class speakers in New York City seemed to orient to “correct” speech norms associated with higher classes, which he attributed to a desire for upward mobility. Similarly, Trudgill (1974) found that the use of stigmatized vernacular features correlated inversely with social class, with lower-class speakers using them more frequently than middle-class speakers. These findings indicate that social class membership
is a meaningful predictive grouping for language behavior; moreover, these behaviors relate to attitudes about language prestige and correctness.

As with the other social categories discussed in this section, social class overlaps with other groupings such as gender and education. For example, individuals with higher socioeconomic status are more likely to achieve higher levels of education (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). As such, social class is problematic to define, and shares with other social categories the disadvantage of obscuring individual experiences (Kerswill, 2009; Mallinson, 2007; Wright, 2005). Social class is particularly complicated in minority (Mallinson, 2007; Rickford, 1986) and immigrant communities, where home- and host-country social class and socioeconomic status indicators are not necessarily equivalent. For example, differences in higher education, lack of accepted professional credentials, language skills, and/or legal immigration status may cause a middle-class Latin American to be ineligible for his or her previous occupation, and thus considered working-class upon immigration to the United States. This social mobility can be an important factor in social class (Ash, 2013), as is social orientation and race or immigrant status (Mallinson, 2007; Vallejo & Canizales, 2013).

Nevertheless, social class remains a relevant factor as it reflects social realities including social and linguistic contact and attitudes (Labov, 1966; Trudgill, 1974) and potentially shared ideological orientations and identities related to access to resources and commonalities in occupation and prestige. These broad class-based commonalities and differences include education, professionalized identities (e.g., in “blue-collar” versus “white-collar” occupations), travel and international ties, and social network patterns. Social class is also a useful concept for shedding light on differences between minority and majority community experiences.
Typically, sociolinguistic studies determine social class based on scores assigned for an individual’s level of education, occupation or occupation of the family’s main breadwinner, and individual or family income (Ash, 2013; Kerswill, 2007; Labov, 1966; Scott, 1994; Wolfram, 1969). I coded social class broadly into lower, middle, and upper class as these broader categories better reflected participant information, and also reflect popular conceptions of class organization (Kerswill, 2009). For this study, social class was determined based on the participant’s education level and occupation (or, in the case of younger participants living at home, the education and occupation of the primary breadwinner) following Marks’s (2006) list of occupations by class. I collapsed skilled and unskilled labor, as these often overlap in the immigrant labor force, and coded them as working class. For example, a worker might do both skilled and unskilled labor in construction but without the protection offered by accreditation or unionization, and within a seasonal labor framework. I did not ask about level of income or immigration status as these questions are sensitive, even potentially threatening, and I wanted to maintain participant trust and relaxation.

By my coding, all participants were working or middle class. Working-class status was assigned based on high-school or community college education and non-professional employment (typically labor or service). Middle-class status was assigned based on college or graduate-level education and professional employment. I did not consider home-country social class in this coding, but have noted it in speaker’s biographies where available to provide a more complete picture of individual backgrounds.

---

n No upper-class participants were found based on Marks’s (2006) requirements of elite occupations, income, and prestige.
3.5.6 Immigrant generation

I included immigrant generation as a social factor. As mentioned in section 3.5.4 above, reproductive generation and immigrant generation cannot be assumed to coincide in immigrant communities. In other words, first-generation immigrants are not necessarily the “parental” generation. However, age and immigrant generation can interact in bilingual communities, most particularly in terms of social interaction and relations with “outsiders”, and related questions of identity and ethnic orientation (Hoffman & Walker, 2010; Sharma, 2011).

Participant requirements controlled for language proficiency and exposure. Since all participants were native born or arrived in D.C. before adolescence, their /ae/ use was anticipated to reflect native rather than learner English (Santa Ana, 1993). Participants also indicated similar bilingual behavior (regular spoken use of both languages in different social domains). First-generation speakers were not exposed to English in the first years of their lives, while second-generation speakers were more likely to have had environmental exposure to English at an early age.

Socially, immigrant generation plays an important role in identity. Immigrant generation affects identity in terms of orientation to home country, host culture, and constructed ethnic and “pan-ethnic” social categories which are salient in the United States, such as “Latino” and “Hispanic”. For example, the 2011 National Survey of Latinos conducted by the Pew Research Center’s (2013b) Hispanic Trends Project¹ found that first-generation (foreign-born) Latinos were more likely than second-generation Latinos to self-identify by country of origin (61% vs. 38%), while second-generation Latinos were far more likely to self-identify as “American” (37% vs. 8%). Pan-Latino self-identification was more comparable and less popular across groups,
with 20% of first-generation and 29% of second-generation immigrants identifying simply as “Hispanic” or “Latino” (Taylor, Lopez, Martínez & Velasco, 2012). Further, 1.5-generation immigrants (those arriving after early childhood but before adolescence) are also likely to create new hybrid identities that relate to but go beyond orientation to home country or “American” identities (Chinchilla & Hamilton, 2013).

3.5.7 Country of origin

Country of speaker or parental origin was included as a social factor that might be related to differences in Spanish dialectal substrates and in speakers’ social and immigration experiences. While Spanish dialectal variation is much more studied in terms of consonants rather than vowels, some evidence of vowel centralization exists in Mexican Spanish, and there is some mid-vowel raising in Caribbean dialects (Hualde, Olarrea, & O’Rourke, 2012, p. 91). Further, national boundaries play an important ideological role in Latin American perceptions of dialect boundaries (Lipski, 2011). Socially, country of origin might reflect identity-related differences in immigrant experience and patterns of social contact. Since participants came from diverse backgrounds, I grouped them in order to avoid single-speaker cells. These groupings related to possible social orientations.

I tested three different social groupings based on participant responses and D.C. demographics and history. The first grouping was Salvadoran versus other Latinos. Salvadorans are the largest and most visible Latino population in the D.C. area, and as such might share commonalities of experience and a strong sense of community identity, which Salvadoran participants expressed in interviews. The second group was Central Americans (including Mexico) versus South Americans. Central Americans in general are a large population in the D.C. area, and they share a history of immigration based on home-country political unrest and
economic instability in the 1980s that coincided with the Refugee Act of 1980. Immigration from Central America has increased since 1990 (Gzesh, 2006; Stoney & Batalova 2013; Stoney, Batalova & Russell, 2013). Central American immigrants tend to be less educated than other foreign-born groups, have lower English proficiency, and are more likely to live in poverty. In contrast, South Americans tend to be better-educated, have higher English proficiency, and be better off financially (Stoney & Batalova, 2013; Stoney, Batalova & Russell, 2013). The third grouping was mixed-origin (i.e., Salvadoran-Mexican, Cuban-Venezuelan, etc.) versus other, as mixed Latino origin was identified by participants and pilot study participants as an important aspect of identity.

3.5.8 Residency

City or suburb residence was also investigated. Historically, immigrants to the United States often settled in ethnic neighborhoods in urban areas (Frey, 2015; Singer, 2004), giving rise to ethnolects. Conversely, due to “white flight” and other historical and economic factors, suburbs tended to be European American enclaves where general American English varieties were spoken. This could suggest that urban Latinos would be more likely to use ethnolectal /ae/ realizations than more-assimilated suburb residents. However, residency patterns are shifting in Washington, D.C., with Latino residents increasingly displaced to outer neighborhoods and bordering suburbs, where new enclaves are forming. Residency is therefore an interesting factor to consider in my study, as Trudgill (1974) also found that degree of contact between social groups (in the Norwich case, social classes) in suburbs affected language variation and use of (non)-prestige features.
3.6 Intra-speaker Analysis

The inter-speaker analysis I have just described aimed to uncover possible shared usage patterns in /ae/ variation in speakers as a group. However, these broad correlations can obscure more complex patterns (for example, “gender” as a category can obscure social networks and group affiliation; Eckert, 1990; Milroy & Milroy, 1992). As Schilling-Estes (1998) and Podesva (2007) observe, detailed studies of small groups and individuals can more accurately reveal the subtle social meanings that speaker enact using different variables. I therefore conducted intra-speaker variation analysis of individuals’ interviews and self-recordings. I used mixed-model regression analysis to test the effects of preceding and following phonetic environment and interactional context against /ae/ realization in interview and self-recorded data (Candida), and against discourse topics in the interview data (Marcos). Statistically significant results were identified based on p values of less than 0.05 and taken as indications of style shifting and of social meaning for /ae/. Individual word was included as a random effect.

3.6.1 Interactional context

Variation in different types of linguistic encounter may be motivated by external factors such as perceived formality (Labov, 1972a), where more standard features may be preferred in more “formal” contexts, or by addressee for purposes of affiliation and distance (Bell, 1984). Comparison of data obtained in different types of encounters therefore offers productive insight into speakers’ repertoires more broadly. This approach is able to account for effects that may be meaningful for some speakers but do not appear in the interview data. For example, significant variation between interview and non-interview data may indicate that F1/F2 variation is
meaningful in terms of particular associations (formality, etc.) highlighted in different interactional contexts.

Candida was selected for intra-speaker analysis due to the quality of her self-recorded data. I analyzed her speech in three different interactional settings: a sociolinguistic interview conducted by me; a conversation while walking in a park with a friend, who is a non-Hispanic immigrant of Afro-Caribbean descent; and at her part-time job at a clothing donation organization. The interview and work recordings were each approximately one hour in length; the park interaction was three hours long.

Candida is a working-class second-generation Mexican American immigrant who resides in the suburbs. She is a native English speaker who is fluent in English and Spanish, speaks Spanish at home and with her parents, and speaks Spanish and English with her younger siblings and with Latino friends. At the time of her interview, she was enrolled in community college and had been accepted at a public university.

3.6.2 Topic-related shifting

Topic-related style shifting can offer insight into identity construction and social meaning. If an individual’s vowel realization varies significantly when discussing different interview topics, it may indicate that the variable can be used meaningfully for particular interactional work (for example, affiliation or excitement) or to index meanings of ethnic identity or belonging (Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Schilling-Estes, 2004). Variation between a low, backed /æ/ realization and the raised and fronted general American English variant has been shown to be a stylistically-active feature of Chicano English (Eckert, 1996) indexically linked to social qualities (for example, toughness and coolness) potentially associated with working-class
minority ethnic status. However, to my knowledge it has not been quantitatively investigated in terms of style shifting between interactional contexts or topics.

Discourse topic, defined broadly as talk about an explicitly articulated theme (for example, language, Latino identity, life in D.C., and country of origin) was coded as an independent variable (Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Tseng, 2011). I first coded topics for the speech of multiple speakers, then selected Marcos for further analysis (discussed in more detail below). Topics emerged from the interview data. While topic could sometimes be identified in terms of interviewee response to questions from the thematic module (e.g., the response to “So, do your children speak Spanish?” would be coded as “language” or possibly “family”), continued discussion of a thematic element was also be used to identify a stretch of discourse as “topic.” Topic identification was triangulated between three coders (myself and two research assistants), with inter-rater reliability calculated based on a four-tier scale of coder agreement, returning an average of 85% agreement. Topics from the questions module were used as the basis for topic coding, but coders added new categories as necessary. The most-frequently-discussed topics were considered potentially meaningful to the speaker and selected for inclusion in the statistical model. Marcos’s most frequently discussed topics were changes in Washington, D.C., primarily gentrification, and demonstrations of general D.C. knowledge, including neighborhoods and childhood experiences.

Marcos was selected for intra-speaker analysis because both his linguistic and social backgrounds suggest that he is a likely candidate to display stylistic variation. He has rich

---

\(^p\) The definition and identification of “topic” is much explored in conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics; however, such detailed discussion lies beyond the scope of this project. A detailed discussion is presented by Fond (2013). In this project, topic was coded impressionistically following Rickford and McNair-Knox (1994), with topic identifications triangulated between three researchers. For more detail, please refer to the methodology discussion in chapter 3.
linguistic resources, including use of Latino English and African American English features; a keen awareness of language as a resource for identity and interactional work; interaction with diverse social groups at different times of his life; and strongly expressed opinions about identity. Marcos uses /æ/ realizations associated with both the European-American and Latino patterns and demonstrates a broad range of individual /æ/ values in pre-nasal and non-nasal contexts, creating the potential for stylistic variation between more-Latino and more general /æ/ realization.

Marcos speaks English and Spanish fluently and grew up in a bilingual family, but identified English as his first productive language. This makes it likely that his English will be used for identity work (Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Santa Ana, 1993). He uses Spanish and English with his family and with Latino friends, and English with his European American wife and in other social domains. He is a second-generation immigrant of mixed Salvadoran/Mexican heritage, and a native Washingtonian who grew up in inner-city D.C. and now resides in Petworth, a traditionally working-class, African American neighborhood currently experiencing gentrification.

3.7 Qualitative Analysis

3.7.1 Individual differences

I used descriptive statistics to interpret group and individual variation. I used Pillai scores to represent the distance between speakers’ pre-nasal and non-nasal /æ/ realizations as a principled comparison of nasal-raising patterns. Pillai scores are statistical measurements that represent the distance between vowel clusters based on individual formant values. Pillai scores describe distance as a proportion of 0-1, with larger scores corresponding to greater distance, and
smaller scores corresponding to lesser distance. They thus make it possible to examine relative overlap and distinction between vowel clusters, for example pre-nasal and non-nasal /æ/. This gives Pillai scores an advantage over Euclidean distances as a means of comparing the relationship between /æ/ realizations in different environments. Euclidean distances measure the distance between vowel sets based on average values rather than taking the distribution of individual tokens into account. Yet, as Hall-Lew (2010) notes, “if the production of one [vowel cluster] is much more variable than the other, then this is descriptively central to the account” of overlap and distinction (p. 2). Pillai scores are more representative of distance and overlap than Euclidean distances because they accommodate distributions of individual tokens rather than depending on simple mathematical averages.

Participants’ Pillai scores were compared with Washingtonian European American Pillai scores for pre-nasal vs. non-pre-nasal /æ/ based on data obtained from the corpus of Language and Communication in Washington, D.C. This database consists of sociolinguistic interviews with Washington, D.C.-area residents. I identified five European American speakers from this database based on the social criteria of native Washingtonian status and continuous residency, and the data quality criterion of sound recordings where clear formant values could be obtained. These requirements led to a sample group well controlled for social and linguistic comparison.

My qualitative methods borrow from ethnography and discourse analysis. I use speaker metacommentary to address individual differences related to social interaction and identity influenced language behavior (Carter, 2007; Gordon, 2000; Rickford, 1985; Santa Ana, 1993). Individual differences in language behavior can relate to speakers’ personal experiences, such as social networks, in- and out-group contact, educational experiences, and experiences with
racism. Ethnolinguistic orientation and visible (racially-marked) minority status may affect maintenance of substrate-origin linguistic features in later generations of speakers (Hoffman & Walker, 2010).

Metadiscourse was also used to examine speaker attitudes and address how social interaction and identity influenced language behavior (Carter, 2007; Gordon, 2000; Rickford, 1985; Santa Ana, 1993). Speaker meta-commentary about language, personal experience, and identity indicated that these themes are relevant to speakers’ daily lives, to their concepts of self and others, and to broader attitudes, ideologies and social stereotypes. Meta-commentary was also used to interpret results; for example, meta-commentary during interviews indicated that ideologies conflating whiteness with linguistic correctness, education, middle class or affluent lifestyles were salient for participants; in contrast, D.C. English was characterized as “ghetto”, a term carrying well-established racial associations with blackness (Carter, 2009; Chun, 2011). These perceptions related to local race relations, immigration histories, and gentrification and its effects on the Latino population, including displacement.

3.7.2 Case study: Marcos

In a case-study sociophonetic analysis of Marcos’ speech, I investigated the distribution of a subset of lowered and backed tokens /æ/ tokens, both pre-nasal and non-pre-nasal, during moments of discursive identity construction in his sociolinguistic interview. Tokens were identified as low and/or backed following previous research indicating that F1 and F2 may operate independently in terms of style (Eckert, 1996; Fought, 2003). The tokens selected for analysis fell outside of one standard deviation from Marcos’s /æ/ mean, at a confidence interval of 68%. This means that tokens identified as “low” fell into the lowest 14% of Marcos’s /æ/ realizations, and tokens identified as “backed” fell into the most-backed 14% of realizations.
These tokens were selected for stylistic analysis, given previous research that “vowel stylization more readily occurs for vowels on the periphery of the vowel space” (Hofwegen, 2013, n.p.; see also Kiesling, 2012; Podesva, 2011). Analysis examined correlations between these /ae/ tokens, and the “conversational contexts in which [they] are uttered” (Podesva, 2011, p. 254).

I used positioning as a principled means of addressing identity work in Marcos’s interview. Positioning is enacted through many diverse linguistic strategies which activate or “make relevant” different aspects of ideology for purposes of self-representation (De Fina, 2013a, p. 45; see also Bamberg, 1997). These include discourse moves such as stancework (Du Bois, 2007) and a range of discursive, suprasegmental, and semantic strategies or “contextualization cues” (Gumperz, 1982). In this dissertation, I operationalize positioning using 1) person reference, with focus on pronoun usage and attributed qualities as a means of identifying we- and they-group demarcation; and 2) stancework.

Person reference is an important linguistic mechanism for group construction and alignment. Person reference is inherent to group formation via positioning and (dis)alignment in that it is used to express relationships between individuals and groups, and to attribute qualities to them. Person-reference terms include names, relational and non-relational descriptions, often-contrastive category terms (for example, mother/father), and pronouns (Stivers, Enfield, & Levinson, 2007), which encode self- and other-positioning. The in- and out-groups created through person reference are simultaneously positioned in relationship to each other and attributed different characteristics. This positions the groups in affiliation or opposition to each other or to ideological reference points.
Stances entail positioning and express speaker feelings, evaluations, and knowledge claims towards the stance object (Du Bois, 2007). Speaker stance is therefore a productive means of identifying positions, and of providing insight into speakers’ values and the social motivations for stylistic variation. For example, repeated usage of low, backed /æ/ while discursively creating a Latino in-group might indicate ethnocultural associations with this realization.

I operationalized stance using previously documented linguistic features as the initial basis for identification, due to the extensive typologies of stance-related linguistic features available (for example, Biber & Finegan’s [1989] groundbreaking research on adverbials in affective stance; Du Bois’s [2007] research on evaluative stance; Jaffe’s [2009] summary of linguistic forms that have been shown to index stances; and Kärkkäinen’s [2006] extensive work on epistemic stance-taking in English). Evaluative stances can be expressed using a variety of resources, such as “comparative adjectives, negation, and adverbs of degree” (Johnstone, 2009, p. 31; see also Hunston & Thompson, 2000, pp. 6-13); evaluative adjectives and nouns (Du Bois, 2007; Hunston & Sinclair, 2000); and evaluative “that” constructions (Hyland & Tse, 2005). For example, as we will see in later chapters, Marcos takes a positive evaluative stance towards the surviving aspects of “authentic,” pre-gentrification D.C. by repeatedly characterizing those residual elements as “good.” He contrasts this with the rudeness of newly arrived “yuppies”: “You know uh, it’s just sad to see that. But that’s- it’s- little, it- it’s, the THRIVING places that you see that. But if you go to different pockets there’s still family. There’s still good stuff there’s still good food good people good music, FROM here.” This evaluation is rooted in values of local authenticity, drawn from Marcos’s lived experience in D.C., and it positions “good people
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9 Conversely, use of high, fronted /æ/ while self-positioning as “capable,” might indicate that the speaker associates this realization with linguistic correctness and capability (an assumption supported by meta-linguistic commentary about “accented” speech; see Tseng, 2011).
from here” and their cultural behaviors as a group distanced from the new residents who have wreaked “sad” changes in the community.

In terms of epistemic stancework, Kärkkäinen (2003) identifies several key resources: adverbials (“undoubtedly, surely, maybe, probably, might, may”); phrases indicating degree of speaker commitment (“I think”, “I believe”); modals expressing evidentiality and conjecture (“must,” “should”); and epistemic expressions of knowledge sources (“people say”) (p. 52, see also Chafe [1986], pp. 262-265). The use of evidential adverbials and expressions is also documented by Biber and Finegan (1989) and by Conrad and Biber (2000). While Ochs (1996) points out that indications of stance are not limited to linguistic features and also involve paralinguistic resources, such as phonological lengthening, laughter, and repetition, this analysis identified stances using the structural features I have identified above.

Through the mixed-methods approach described in this chapter, I hope to contribute to a deeper sociophonetic understanding of /æ/ variation in the English of Washington, D.C. Latinos, especially its role in the interactional construction of identity. The following chapters present the study’s data analysis and findings.

\footnote{Also see Thompson and Hunston (2000), pp. 20–21.}
CHAPTER 4: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I present the results of quantitative variation analysis, addressing the study’s two main research questions:

1) How does /ae/, a phonological feature showing a well-documented distinction between Chicano English and general American English varieties, vary in the English of Washington, D.C. Latinos?

2) How does /ae/ variation contribute to stylistic variation and interactional construction of identity in sociolinguistic interviews and other interactional contexts?

I used mixed-model statistical regression analysis to test the effect of linguistic and social factors on /ae/ realization in all speakers as a group (inter-speaker variation), and in selected individuals (intra-speaker variation). Inter-speaker analysis addressed /ae/ realization by linguistic and social factors as a comparison with previous research on general American and Chicano English, with implications for the development of substrate-related linguistic features. Intra-speaker analysis addressed /ae/ variation in the speech of individuals in different interactional contexts and when discussing different topics. Qualitative analysis indicated that individual differences based on speakers’ personal histories and social interaction also play a role.

It is important to investigate the relationship between independent social and linguistic factors and variation in the dependent variable using statistical measures, rather than a simple frequency count and percent calculation. In the whole-group analysis, I used mixed-effects regression modelling to test the relationship between external social and linguistic factors and the dependent variable (/ae/). In the individual analysis, I used mixed-effects regression modeling to
test the relationship between interactional factors, such as topic and interaction type, and the
dependent variable.

Statistically significant effects of the linguistic and social factors described below on /ae/
realization along the F1 and F2 dimensions were identified based on p values of less than 0.05.
This value, standard in the social and behavioral sciences, establishes a threshold of less than 5%
probability that the correlation between vowel variation and a given social or linguistic category
may be attributed to chance. The strength and directionality of different conditioning effects was
determined by logarithmic-odds coefficient values returned by the mixed-effects regression
analysis, which indicate the relative impact that a given predictor has on the vowel along these
dimensions. So for example, a large coefficient value for following nasal environment in terms
of F2 would indicate that following nasals have a strong influence in conditioning /ae/ fronting.

As described in the previous chapter on methodology, mixed-effects analysis offers
several advantages for my data set. The first is that vowels can be treated as continuous rather
than binary variables. This treatment allows for the examination of the effects of different factors
on gradient variability, or relative degrees of /ae/ raising (F1) and fronting/backing (F2),
revealing trajectories indicating potential maintenance of transfer-origin phonology within the
speaker group and possible stylistic usage in individuals. For example, this analysis might reveal
that Latino speakers with higher levels of education are more likely to use a higher, fronted /ae/
realization, as in general American English, than speakers with less formal education; or that a
given speaker uses more ethnolectal, lower, backed realizations when discussing topics related to
different aspects of identity. Mixed-model regression analysis also takes individual differences
(random effects) into account, such as speaker and word effect. This means that the impact of
different individuals’ /ae/ patterns and of lexical conditioning is taken into account when estimating the significance of different linguistic and social factors. For example, in regression analysis that does not take random effects into account, a sex effect where women use higher /ae/ realizations than men might in truth be attributable to individual variation affecting the group pattern. By including speaker and word as random effects in the model, mixed-method analysis ensures that independent factors returned as significant are indeed predictors of patterns above the level of individual variation. Similarly, word is included in individual analysis to ensure that independent factor results are significant above and beyond the lexical conditioning that forms a normal part of natural data sets.

Quantitative analysis aimed to establish whether non-standard /ae/ variation, potentially associated with Latino English practices based on comparison with well-described features of Chicano English, was present in this sample of D.C. Latinos; whether /ae/ variation varied according to external social factors; and whether /ae/ varied stylistically by topic and interactional context. Qualitative analysis of individual speakers was used to interpret results. I first describe the quantitative analysis and findings for the whole group of speakers. I then describe analyses of /ae/ patterning in two individual speakers of particular interest. Based on this whole-group and individual analysis, I conclude by motivating the selection of an individual speaker, “Marcos”, for further detailed analysis in the qualitative discourse-analytic chapter which follows (chapter 5).

4.1 Inter-speaker Analysis

In this dissertation, I applied mixed-effects regression analysis to test the effects of preceding phonetic environment, following phonetic environment, and social factors on the
dependent variables F1 (corresponding to /ae/ raising and lowering) and F2 (corresponding to /ae/ fronting and backing). Independent linguistic factors were preceding and following phonetic environment by voicing/manner and by place of articulation, following Roeder (2009). Independent social factors were the classic sociolinguistic variables of age, sex, and level of education. Since speakers are immigrants, immigrant generation (first or second) and country of familial origin (for example, El Salvador) were included as independent factors. City versus suburban residence was also included as an independent factor. Individual speaker and word were included as random effects. I first tested the effects of preceding phonetic environment, following phonetic environment, and social factors on F1 values in a single step-up step-down run that also tested for interactions between factor groups such as age and sex. I then repeated the procedure to test all factors and interactions against F2. Where collinearity between external factors was observed, i.e. between preceding phonetic environment voicing/manner and place of articulation, I accounted for this by testing the collinear factors separately against all other factors and found consistent results between modeling runs in both significant factors and coefficient rankings.

Statistically significant results are shown in the tables below. Results are ranked from top to bottom by strongest to weakest effect on /ae/ realization, based on p values. The lowest p values (for example, p=3.35x10^{-38}) correspond with the strongest predictive relationships between independent factors and F1 or F2 realization; larger p values (for example, p=0.0258) indicate relatively weaker but still highly significant relationships between predictive factors and

---

8 Collinearity is a naturally-occurring phenomenon common to natural (versus experimental) data sets. Drummond (2010) similarly tested place and manner of articulation separately to avoid collinearity in his regression modeling.
the dependent variable. I describe these results in more detail below and in the sections that follow.

Results showed voicing and manner of following phonetic environment, voicing and manner of preceding phonetic environment, and preceding place of articulation were found to be significant for F1 and F2, with ordering of coefficients generally consistent with previous research on /æ/ variation in American English (Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2009). Speaker residence in D.C. proper or the inner suburbs that border the city was found to be significant for F1.

In the following section, I provide an overview of findings. I will discuss linguistic findings first before turning to social factor results. I also use descriptive statistics and Pillai scores to help interpret individual and group variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent factor</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 FFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>$p=3.35\times10^{-38}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 PFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>$p=2.71\times10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 PFE by place of articulation</td>
<td>$p=0.00177$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 by urban/suburban residence</td>
<td>$p=0.0258$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p<0.05$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent factor</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2 FFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>$p=3.71\times10^{-34}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 PFE by place of articulation</td>
<td>$p=1.62\times10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 PFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>$p=1.4\times10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p<0.05$
4.1.1 Linguistic factors

Following phonetic environment (FFE) voicing and manner had the strongest conditioning effect on F1 \((p=3.35\times10^{-38})\), followed by preceding phonetic environment (PFE) voicing/manner \((p=2.71\times10^{-6})\), preceding place of articulation \((p=0.00177)\), and speaker residence \((p=0.0258)\). Following phonetic environment voicing and manner also had the strongest effect on F2 \((p=3.71\times10^{-34})\), followed by preceding phonetic environment place of articulation and voicing/manner \((p=1.62\times10^{-10}, p=1.4\times10^{-8})\). These findings show that following place of articulation had the strongest overall influence on /ae/ along both the vertical (F1) and horizontal (F2) dimensions. F1 was more affected by voicing/manner of articulation than F2, but both were strongly affected. Preceding phonetic environment, both in terms of voicing/manner and place of articulation, was significant for both F1 and F2. However F2, which corresponds to relative degrees of vowel fronting or backing, was more strongly influenced by preceding phonetic environment than was F1. This finding is consistent with previous research (for example, Alfonso & Baer, 1982; Cole et al., 2010; Manuel & Krakow, 1984; Stevens & House, 1963) showing that vowels may be more sensitive to coarticulatory effects along the F2 than F1 dimensions; however, both F1 and F2 are perceptually salient dimensions along which social information is identified (Labov, 2001a). In terms of preceding phonetic environment, place of articulation affected F2 somewhat more than voicing/manner (Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001, p. 754). Preceding voicing/manner’s effect on F1 was comparable to its effect on F2. F1 was affected to a lesser degree by preceding place of articulation, but results were still highly significant. This finding is consistent with Hillenbrand, Clark, and Neary’s (2001) report that voicing and manner affect /ae/ F1 more than does place of articulation (pp. 754-755). I will address these linguistic factor groups in order of their significance.
4.1.2 Following phonetic environment

I now discuss specific predictive environments within external factor categories, and the direction of variation (for example, the effect of particular following linguistic environments, such as nasal consonants, on /æ/ raising/lowering and fronting/backing). Linguistic coefficient rankings and positive/negative coefficient values indicated effects of particular linguistic environments on /æ/ variation and direction of variation. Since F2 corresponds directly with fronted or backed position in the vowel space, large coefficient values indicate that a given linguistic environment favors fronted /æ/ realization, and low coefficient values indicate a tendency towards backed /æ/ realization. Since F1 corresponds inversely with vowel height, low coefficient values indicate that a given linguistic environment favors raised /æ/ realization, and large coefficient values indicate a tendency towards lowered /æ/ realization. Tables present following linguistic environments, coefficient values ranked in order of their effects on raising/lowering (F1, table 4) and fronting/backing (F2, table 5), means for each category, and token counts represented as frequency counts and percentages of the total.

Findings were generally consistent with previous research, namely Roeder (2006, 2009), Hillenbrand, Clark, and Neary (2001), Labov (2001), and Labov, Ash, and Boberg (2006). I begin with following phonetic environment. Tables 4 and 5 present results for F1 and F2, respectively.
Table 4. F1 Following phonetic environment (FFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>-122.140</td>
<td>691.686</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>-19.373</td>
<td>815.207</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>29.355</td>
<td>834.404</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>30.959</td>
<td>782.403</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>42.453</td>
<td>851.180</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=3.35x10^-38

Table 5. F2 Following phonetic environment (FFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>225.490</td>
<td>1984.536</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>-26.721</td>
<td>1742.251</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>-51.799</td>
<td>1636.873</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>-72.299</td>
<td>1688.749</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>-74.671</td>
<td>1610.305</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=3.71x10^-34

Following nasal environment (e.g. “ban”) plainly conditioned /ae/ raising and fronting. This was the strongest conditioning pattern observed for both F1 and F2. This nasal raising and fronting pattern is typical of American English generally, due to the coarticulatory velum-raising effect I described in section 4.1.1 (Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2006, 2009; Eckert, 2008a). Following voiced stops slightly conditioned /ae/ raising, a result also found by Roeder (2009) in keeping with Hillenbrand, Clark, and Neary’s (2001) finding that voicing conditions vowel raising, possibly due to lowered laryngeal position. Voiceless fricatives and voiceless stops most conditioned lowered and backed realizations. These findings are consistent with previous research as represented by Roeder (2009).
4.1.3 Preceding phonetic environment

I now turn to a discussion of preceding phonetic environments. Again, I am following the order of factor significance (tables 2 and 3 above); tables 6 and 7 present F2 results, and tables 8 and 9 present F1.

Table 6. F2 Preceding phonetic environment (PFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>44.703</td>
<td>1757.801</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>37.592</td>
<td>1816.623</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>36.763</td>
<td>1707.174</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>20.469</td>
<td>1916.711</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H or pause</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>1747.534</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>-32.875</td>
<td>1797.602</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td>-109.379</td>
<td>1590.096</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=1.62x10-10

Table 7. F2 Preceding phonetic environment (PFE) by place of articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>111.997</td>
<td>1976.187</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apical</td>
<td>12.820</td>
<td>1735.264</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H or pause</td>
<td>4.373</td>
<td>1747.564</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labial</td>
<td>-14.981</td>
<td>1823.643</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid apical</td>
<td>-114.209</td>
<td>1590.096</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=1.4x10-8

The strongest effect was that preceding liquid consonants had a backing effect. This strong backing effect of liquids, which is noted by Labov (1994) and Roeder (2009) and has been explored in laboratory phonology by Tunley (1999), may be due to the backing influence of liquids’ tongue dorsum retraction. Preceding velars strongly conditioned fronting. This effect is consistent with previous findings of velar environment-conditioned F2 fronting (Hillenbrand, Clark & Neary, 2001; Labov, 2004; Roeder, 2006), possibly due to articulatory undershoot due
to closed velum position (Roeder, 2009). Preceding voiced stops also conditioned fronting with a moderate effect size, similar to nasals and voiced fricatives, and labials showed a backing effect. These findings are broadly consistent with previous research as summarized by Roeder (2009).

Tables 8 and 9 present preceding phonetic environments for F1.

**Table 8. F1 Preceding phonetic environment by voicing/manner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>-43.800</td>
<td>752.600</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>-17.226</td>
<td>745.133</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>-3.768</td>
<td>807.545</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>4.819</td>
<td>795.739</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H or pause</td>
<td>14.244</td>
<td>800.867</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>15.896</td>
<td>729.017</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td>29.835</td>
<td>861.057</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=2.71x10^-6

**Table 9. F1 Preceding phonetic environment by place of articulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apical</td>
<td>-23.896</td>
<td>755.646</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>-9.285</td>
<td>744.318</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labial</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>756.488</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H or pause</td>
<td>7.648</td>
<td>800.867</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid apical</td>
<td>24.935</td>
<td>861.057</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.00177

The most general result was that preceding liquids conditioned /ae/ lowering. In terms of voicing and manner, voiced fricatives had a strong raising effect, likely due to voicing effects (Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001). In terms of place of articulation, preceding apicals and velars had a raising effect. This is consistent with Roeder’s (2009) findings, which she attributes to the higher tongue position of velar and apical consonants leading to articulatory undershoot in vowel realization, and with Hillenbrand, Clark, and Neary’s (2001) findings that alveolar and velar consonants conditioned vowel raising.
To summarize: linguistic factors were generally in agreement with other findings on consonantal conditioning in American English and Chicano English (Roeder, 2009). Following nasals had by far the strongest effect on fronting and raising, and liquids consistently conditioned lowering and backing. Following voiceless fricatives and voiceless stops conditioned lowered and backed realizations, while following voiced stops conditioned /æ/ raising. Preceding fricatives, apicals, and velars conditioned vowel raising. Preceding velars and voiced stops conditioned fronting; preceding labials conditioned backing. No evidence of the geographically nearest regional patterns, the mid-Atlantic (Philadelphia) split short-a system or Southern breaking pattern, was found.¹ These findings support Roeder’s (2009) statement that these linguistic conditioning effects may be universals of co-articulation. Since following nasals had by far the strongest conditioning effect, my participants appear to be following a general nasal-raising pattern. Consistent with Latino rather than general American English, however, this raising is attenuated, as we will see in the following section.

4.1.4 Pre-nasal /æ/

I now turn to an examination of /æ/ in pre-nasal position, the environment in which Chicano English is well documented as diverging from general American English (Fought, 2003; Thomas, 2001). Further investigation showed that speakers’ nasal pattern was more consistent with research on Chicano English than with the general American English pattern. In order to ground this in the local speech environment, I compared Latino participants’ results with pre-nasal and non-nasal /æ/ in European American Washingtonian speakers. While the strongest conditioning environment for both /æ/ fronting and raising was when the vowel preceded a nasal

---

¹ Among other conditioning effects, the Philadelphia split short-a system would predict /æ/ raising before voiceless fricatives, which was not observed. In the Southern breaking pattern, /æ/ lengthens and diphthongizes in all contexts. No audible evidence of off-glides or diphthongization was observed.
consonant, this nasal-raising pattern is weaker than the D.C. pattern as per a comparison with European American Washingtonians\(^a\) from the Language and Communication in Washington, D.C. corpus and the Atlas of North American English (Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006).

Comparison of normalized data showed that Latino speakers had a less split pattern than European American speakers, with low, backed /æ/ realization in the key pre-nasal position. As figure 6 shows, speakers’ overall /æ/ averages in the key pre-nasal environment (represented by the word “ban”) were lower and further back in the vowel space than the European American D.C. averages for both men and women. Latino speakers’ non-pre-nasal /æ/ (“bat”) was also lower than European American’s /æ/. Raised pre-nasal /æ/ for Latinas may be attributable to individual speakers (Diana and Gracia) who have high pre-nasal /æ/ averages (table 10) and, as will be seen, nasal-split patterns comparable to European Americans (table 12).

---

\(^{a}\) Five European American speakers were selected for comparison based on native Washingtonian status, continuous residency, and sound recordings where clear formant values could be obtained. These requirements led to a sample group well controlled for social and linguistic comparison.
Figure 6. Latino /ae/ averages in pre-nasal position, vs. D.C. averages from LCDC corpus

Individual patterns are presented in tables 10 and 11, where the majority of Latino speakers show low, backed pre-nasal /ae/ relative to the European American averages.

Table 10. Speaker pre-nasal /ae/ versus the D.C. average: F1 (Hz)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>617.9</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>616.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>665.8</td>
<td>Gracia</td>
<td>636.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcos</td>
<td>681.9</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>674.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobo</td>
<td>690.9</td>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>677.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>728.6</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>717.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso</td>
<td>728.7</td>
<td>Viviana</td>
<td>739.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel</td>
<td>741.1</td>
<td>Candida</td>
<td>750.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Speaker pre-nasal /ae/ versus the D.C. average: F2 (Hz)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>F2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>2092.1</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>2217.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>2024.4</td>
<td>Gracia</td>
<td>2137.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcos</td>
<td>1977.4</td>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>2085.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel</td>
<td>1971.9</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>2004.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>1938.1</td>
<td>Candida</td>
<td>1884.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobo</td>
<td>1937.6</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>1883.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso</td>
<td>1896.3</td>
<td>Viviana</td>
<td>1784.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I further substantiate this pattern using Pillai scores, a statistical measurement that represents the distance between vowel clusters based on individual formant values rather than averages. This makes Pillai scores a more accurate measurement of distance and overlap between vowel clusters than Euclidean distances based on token averages, which obscure the linguistic effects of phonological environment and of socially-motivated variation such as style (Hall-Lew, 2010). Pillai scores represent distance as a proportion of 0-1, with larger scores corresponding to greater distance, and smaller scores corresponding to lesser distance. Table 12 gives Pillai scores for European American and Latino speakers. It can be seen that the European American Pillai scores are higher (approximately 0.5-0.9), indicating a large distance between pre-nasal and non-nasal /ae/, or a high degree of pre-nasal raising and fronting, while Latino scores are lower (approximately 0.1-0.5), indicating much less distance and a lower, more backed pre-nasal /ae/. Three Latino speakers, Grace, Felix, and Diana, have Pillai scores equivalent or approaching European American scores. This information is also represented graphically in figure 7.

The majority of Latino speakers show Pillai scores of below 0.6. In contrast, European American speakers (Turing, Carla, Curtis, Fred, Mark) form the high end of the spectrum (0.67-0.86). As this shows, the majority of Latino speakers showed less of a pre-nasal distinction,
except for the three Latino speakers with Pillai scores of 0.6 upwards. Felix and Diana were both raised in primarily Anglo-American social environments and are often called “Americanized” or “white” by friends, family, and other Latinos. Their /æ/ patterning is likely due to this linguistic and social environment, and concurrent sense of identity. Diana characterized her own high school as “all white kids”; this again may play a role in her language use, although she has a strong Latina identity, socializes primarily with Latinos, and comes from a working-class family. These findings highlight the importance of both linguistic exposure and identity factors in language variation, and indicate the need for future study to examine the relationship between these elements.

Table 12. Latino and European American Pillai scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European-Americans</th>
<th>Latinos</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>0.86873</td>
<td>Gracia</td>
<td>0.68939</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>0.41606</td>
<td>Viviana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>0.86075</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>0.65498</td>
<td>Marcos</td>
<td>0.39119</td>
<td>Candida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>0.72329</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>0.62423</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>0.33838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>0.7103</td>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>0.50213</td>
<td>Emanuel</td>
<td>0.28004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turing</td>
<td>0.67841</td>
<td>Jacobo</td>
<td>0.45276</td>
<td>Alonso</td>
<td>0.21964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings substantiate that the majority of Latino speakers have a lesser distinction between /ae/ in pre-nasal and non-nasal environments than European American speakers. Further, pre-nasal /ae/ was generally lower and further back than European American pronunciations, and non-nasal /ae/ was typically lower (figure 6). These findings are in line with previous research on Chicano English, where a weaker nasal-raising pattern than that of general American English is well documented (Eckert, 1996; Fought, 2003; Gordon, 2001; Roeder, 2006, 2009). Further, this variation appears to be a systemic part of these speakers’ native English rather than a consequence of non-native English, since speakers distinguish between /ae/ and /ɛ/ (BET) as separate phonemes in the vowel space, which Fought (2003) notes is a key difference between Chicano English as a native variety, and the English of non-native speakers. This distinction can be seen in figure 6 above.
Taken together, these findings indicate that the Latino speakers in my study are speaking a native variety of American English with a nasal pattern similar to Chicano English rather than general American English. While further research is necessary to document other features of a potential Latino English variety in Washington, D.C., these findings are suggestive that at least in terms of the /ae/ vowel, similar linguistic processes may be at work, leading to the incorporation of substrate-origin non-standard /ae/ into a native English dialect.

4.1.5 Social factors

I now turn to a discussion of social factors affecting /ae/ realization. F1 was significantly affected by residence (table 13), with D.C. residence conditioning raised /ae/ realization and residence in the bordering suburbs conditioning lower /ae/. No interactions between factor groups were observed. Since speakers were not selected for balanced residence, suburb residents were both men and women, while city residents were only men. However, no interaction was observed between sex and residence in the statistical model, indicating that the residence pattern independently affects /ae/ realization at a significance level of p<0.05.

Table 13. Effect of D.C. or suburbs residency on F1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>-12.098</td>
<td>761.184</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>12.098</td>
<td>782.030</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.0258

A likely explanation for these findings is shifting demographic and residency patterns in the D.C. metropolitan area. Since gentrification began in Washington, D.C. in 2000 (Sturtevant, 2014), there has been a shift in Latino residency patterns from original center-city barrios such as Columbia Heights and Mount Pleasant to the city’s outer wards and bordering suburbs as prices
rose. For example, in Montgomery County, Maryland, which borders D.C., the Latino population increased from approximately 12% to 17% of the total population between 2000 and 2010. In D.C. proper, the growth rate has slowed since 2000: from 1990-2000, the D.C. Latino population increased from 5% to 8%, but from 2000-2010 increased only to 9% (all figures from the U.S. Census Bureau). The Washington Business Journal lists Columbia Heights as one of the city’s top gentrifying neighborhoods, in the sense that property values, which were below the city average in 2001, have since climbed more significantly than in almost any other neighborhood (Neibauer, 2013, Washington Business Journal).

This demographic pattern is a departure from many previous research contexts. Typically, research on American English varieties associates cities with working-class and ethnic dialects (Eckert, 1990; Reyes, 2005; Wolfram, 2004, p. 111), which sometimes incorporate features (phonological and otherwise) derived from substrate influence in immigrant communities. Pittsburghe is one example (Johnstone, 2013); another is Multicultural London English (Cheshire, Kerswill, Fox & Torgersen, 2011). Suburban speakers are typically assumed to be white, middle-class, and speakers of less-marked general American English varieties. The differences between suburban and urban speech are marked: Eckert (1989) noted that suburban youth in Michigan used varying levels of Northern Cities-shifted phonological features depending on peer group and social orientation towards a tough, working-class urban identity. Cutler (1997) notes the separation of city/suburb communities, and their associated linguistic, racial, and socio-economic differences, in her study of white, middle-class, suburban adolescents’ use of African American English phonological features, noting that these speakers are largely isolated from contact with African Americans (p. 384). Recent work on variation in
the multicultural immigrant populations of European suburbs (Thränhardt, 1992, p. 142) may be more in line with D.C.’s sociolinguistic environment. For example, Kotsinas (1992, 1997) examined the emergence of a new variety of Swedish in a culturally mixed suburb of Stockholm, which is often negatively judged as deficient by majority-group Swedes.

The U.S. language practices I described above derive from the historical ethnic enclaves that arose in cities for social and economic reasons, such as industrial jobs, “white flight” from cities to suburbs post-WWII, and housing segregation (Blakeslee, 1979; Boustan, 2010). However, recent work in demography and sociology indicates that suburbs are diversifying as immigrants are increasingly drawn to them in new patterns of migration (Frey, 2015; Singer, 2004). These patterns are reflected in my study of Washington, D.C.-area Latinos. Suburban residents in my study were younger (18-30 years of age), and their background is a reflection of the changed, post-2000 migration and settlement pattern. These speakers reported primarily Latino social networks, such as Latino student government, youth organizations, and friends. As a group, they typically were working class and had lower levels of education at the time they were interviewed (community college); their parents did not have much formal education and tended to work in labor or service. They thus had more in common with the traditional urban ethnic communities described above than with traditional suburbanites.

In contrast, the urban residents in my study tended to be more affluent, with one or both primary earners having professional employment, irrespective of their diverse ultimate levels of educational attainment (from high school diploma to graduate degree). Urban speakers reported diverse friend groups and commitment to diversity; the majority were in long-term romantic relationships with European American partners. However, urban speakers generally expressed
strong Latino identification and had social network connections to the original inner-city Latino neighborhoods.

Sociolinguistic contact and related identity concerns are an important factor in ethnolectal variation, as Rickford (1985) points out: “Contact and social identity – or the limited availability of opportunity and motivation for adopting the patterns of other ethnic groups besides one’s own – loom largest in the maintenance of inter-ethnic linguistic differences” (p. 118). Social interaction is well documented as the nexus for language acquisition and socialization (Ochs, 1993; Sankoff, 2002; Santa Ana, 1993) and has been shown to be relevant to Chicano English /ae/ variation (Gordon, 2000). Diverse research approaches to the influence of different types of social groupings in the development of dialects, styles, and repertoires agree that who you interact with affects the way you speak, both in terms of the varieties acquired (in the case of Chicano English, perhaps with substrate transfer), and in terms of their potential for identity expression (Eckert, 2006; Gumperz, 1971; Labov, 1972a; LePage & Tabouret-Keller, 1985; Milroy, 1980; Sharma, 2011).

The gentrification of D.C. over the past decade and a half means that the Latino speakers in my study who more closely fit the traditional profile of conditions for ethnolectal development live in the suburbs. These participants are typically working class, first-generation immigrants who arrived in the United States as children, but speak English fluently. They primarily interact with ethnic community members and report strong ethnocultural affiliation; and they maintain transnational ties via visits to family in the home country, when possible, and through various digital media practices (social media, Skype, digital camera recordings, etc.) (De Fina, 2013b; Hoffman & Walker, 2010; Santa Ana, 1993). These social and interactional patterns likely
inform speakers’ linguistic behavior, allowing for acquisition of different linguistic features and the potential to use them for different communicative and identity-expressive purposes. For example, speakers with a strong ethnocultural orientation who interact primarily with other members of their ethnic communities are more likely to acquire and use ethnolectal linguistic features (Hoffman & Walker, 2010; Santa Ana, 1993), while speakers with more diverse social networks can maintain these features but have increased repertoire diversity (Sharma, 2011).

In addition to its explanatory power for inter-group variation by residence, social interaction is germane to qualitative patterns observed in the data on the level of individual speakers. Within the broader findings, individual differences were clearly discernable. As previously described, Felix and Gracia’s nasal /ae/ patterns are similar to those of European Americans, as indicated by Pillai scores between 0.65 and 0.9 (see table 12). This can likely be explained by their greater degree of assimilation in terms of social class, education, and the personal identities they expressed through their interviews (Hoffman & Walker, 2010; Rickford, 1985; Santa Ana, 1993): Felix and Gracia are second-generation immigrants who are considered Americanized by themselves and other Latinos, come from affluent backgrounds with educated, professional parents, have little social contact with Latinos outside their immediate families, and attend elite 4-year universities. Similarly, Diana’s Pillai scores also pattern similarly to European Americans (0.62423). However, she is a working-class, first-generation immigrant, who lives in the suburbs, has a strong ethnic orientation, and socializes mainly with Latinos. Her /ae/ pattern may relate to social contact and access to general American English in her high school, which she describes as affluent and “totally white”. Candida, also a working-class suburban resident, shows a strong Latino pattern with backed and lowered /ae/ and almost no nasal-raising (Pillai
score: 0.13586), despite her self-description as a “bad Latina” since she does not orient to Latino culture but rather to academics and Asian pop culture. In contrast to Diana’s privileged high school, Candida attended ethnically and economically diverse public schools. Previous research (Eckert, 1996; Carter, 2007) show that ethnoracial and economic diversity in schools can encourage the use of Chicano English /ae/, the difference in Diana and Candida’s /ae/ patterns may relate to differences in language contact and socialization experiences in their educational backgrounds.

Finally, as described above, urban residents (Felix, Hector, Marcos, and Emanuel) typically had higher socioeconomic status than suburban residents and reported diversity in friend networks and romantic partners. Felix comes from an affluent background, as described above. Hector, Marcos, and Emanuel share social commonalities in contact and identity (Rickford, 1985). These three speakers have been exposed to different English varieties through social networks. They primarily socialized with urban, working-class African Americans and Latinos in childhood and, like Diana, interacted with middle-class European Americans through education. For example, Marcos was sponsored to attend a private D.C. high school. They thus show different characteristics than traditional ethnolectal speakers (Santa Ana, 1993). Their broad exposure to language varieties may explain their diverse linguistic repertoires (Sharma, 2011), which combined the overall low, less-split Latino pattern, as shown by low Pillai scores (table 12), with broad individual distributions of /ae/ realizations, as will be seen in Marcos’s vowel space in chapter 5. Identity work may be particularly relevant to Marcos, Hector, and Emanuel since they also share a strong orientation to Latino identity, a high degree of metalinguistic awareness, and an affinity for language as a form of self-expression: Marcos self-
describes as a linguistic “chameleon”, while Hector and Emanuel are involved in Latino community performance arts and explicitly discussed language as part of identity, including “sounding Latino”. It thus appears that social orientation and social networks play a role in the use of “ethnolectal” and majority-group /ae/ features. This is a finding similar to Gordon’s (2000) observations of Chicano English /ae/ variation in Indiana. In North Carolina, Wolfram, Carter and Moriello (2004) found that monophthongization of /ay/ vowels in Southern White English by adolescent Latino immigrants was related to their alignment with local Anglo peer groups. Speaker metacommentary also raised the topic of cultural and linguistic mixing with African Americans, a theme which I will return to in the following chapter.

4.1.6 Discussion

The majority of the Latino speakers in this study showed an /ae/ realization that was lower and further back than that of European American Washingtonians in the pre-nasal environment. This feature is known to distinguish Chicano English from general American English. Preceding and following linguistic environment significantly affected vowel raising and fronting, and lowering and backing. Following phonetic environment had the strongest effect, with conditioning effects generally consistent with previous research on American English and Chicano English (Eckert, 2008a; Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Jones, 2003; Labov, 1994; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2006, 2009; Thomas, 2001).

In sum, quantitative and descriptive findings on statistically-significant linguistic factors, order of coefficient values, and pre-nasal versus non-nasal /ae/ distinction indicate that Latino speakers in my study are generally following American English phonotactic rules and speaking a native variety of American English with a similar nasal pattern to that of Chicano English rather than general American English. Findings further support the interpretation of the low, backed
/ae/ variant as a systemic feature of Latino participants’ speech, rather than non-native approximation of second-language vowel targets. This indicates that the less-pronounced nasal-raising pattern is not attributable to non-native English. Evidence from speakers’ vowel spaces of separate phonemes for /ae/ and /ɛ/ further support this interpretation, since this phonemic distinction is one key means of distinguishing between Latino English varieties and non-native English (Fought, 2003).

Given the limited sample size, these statistical findings should not be taken as conclusive evidence of a Washington, D.C.-area Latino English variety. Further research is necessary; however, these findings are suggestive that at least in terms of the /ae/ vowel, we may be witnessing evidence of the incorporation of substrate-origin non-standard /ae/ into a native English system.

In terms of social factors influencing variation, /ae/ realization along the F1 but not F2 dimension was significantly affected by residence and sensitive to social factors. Residence significantly affected F1, with suburbs showing a lower /ae/ realization than D.C. proper. This corresponds to gentrification-related residency changes in D.C. that have shifted speakers most likely to develop ethnolectal language features—working-class immigrants with primarily ethnic-group social networks and strong ethnic orientations—to the suburbs. At the same time, urban residents reported more diverse social networks, which are typically associated with broader linguistic repertoires (Sharma, 2011). Social and language contact and identity appear to influence language behavior via interaction (Eckert, 2000; Gordon, 2000; Rickford, 1985; Santa Ana, 1993), as seen in individual variation within these broader patterns. Access or lack of access to general American English and contact with white, middle-class speakers, often via
educational institutions, appeared to affect nasal-raising patterns in at least some speakers. Individual urban speakers also expressed a higher degree of metalinguistic awareness of language as an identity resource, potentially affecting their language behavior. Indeed, one urban participant, Hector, spoke in his interview about the necessity to manifest his Latino identity linguistically, since physically he often is perceived as white. Language—specifically “sounding Latino”—is a key aspect of this self-representation for him, as shown by his metalinguistic commentary:

There's people like ME, who, constantly have to visualize or have to manifest or, or my Latinidad, in physical ways ... you know you're constant declaring this is my culture, because I physically can't show it to you, so I have to have to, sonically or- or you know, like through appearance make it happen ... The nuances of the way I speak, is not, in my opinion and my perception it isn't WHITE. I don't talk like a WHITE dude. But I don't talk like a black guy either, and I- I think, so I, kind of have like a, a twang to my speech, ... I feel like I have my rhythm. And, it's a LATINO rhythm, it's a Spanish rhythm. And, it's despite it being, me speaking English.

These findings imply that social factors can affect variation more subtly than is often assumed. Residence appeared to influence variation as it reflects changing demographics tied to larger social trends; at the same time, speaker residence also reflected individual experiences, with social interaction and contact emerging as prominent influences, and identity as a potential influence. Individual differences related to speakers’ personal experiences, daily-life events and interactions (for example, educational institutions; friendship groups; experiences with racism). This resonates with previous research highlighting the importance of smaller-group studies for investigating social effects on variation in terms of individuals’ experiences, life histories, and identity work, for example Schilling-Estes (2004), rather than relying on simple correlations.
between group patterns and externally imposed social categories assumed *a priori* to be relevant. This level of analysis would be missed by larger-level studies; but smaller studies allow for a more nuanced understanding of how variation may pertain to individuals’ linguistic repertoires, self-presentation, and identity work, while also pointing to new directions for future study and larger sample sizes.

These studies also relate to other research—for example, the larger body of research on Chicano English—with implications for ethnic-group language development in early immigrant generations. They are also relevant to other ethnic groups and contexts, as American immigration patterns change and suburbs become diverse. As suburban populations diversify (Frey, 2015), research on minority and immigrant populations in these contexts will be badly needed, and these speakers’ varieties have much to teach us about the process by which non-standard and transfer-origin linguistic forms become established elements of legitimate language systems with connections to patterns of social contact, ethnic affiliation, cultural pride, and self-presentation.

### 4.2 Intra-speaker Variation

I now turn to a close examination of individual speakers. The quantitative intra-speaker analysis described in this section complements and extends the inter-speaker analysis described above. I applied mixed-model regression analysis to data from two individual speakers, Marcos and Candida, examining /ae/ variation by interview topic and across a range of self-recorded contexts. Quantitative findings revealed statistically significant variation in /ae/ use by topic and interactional setting. This stylistic variation supports the interpretation of low, backed /ae/ as a native English feature for the D.C. speakers in my study (Eckert, 2008a) and suggests future directions for research on its use and potential social associations.
As I discussed in chapter 2, variation may occur not only between speakers, such as suburban residents’ being more likely to use lower /æ/ pronunciation than urban residents, but also within the speech of individuals in agentive self-representation based on social context and interactional participants and goals. Thus, more-standard variants may be preferred in institutional or “formal” interactions, while less-standard variants might be preferred in casual conversation with a friend. Features may be used to create affiliation or distance with other interlocutors (Bell, 1984; Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994) or when discussing particular topics (Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Schilling-Estes, 2004). Stylistic variation, or variation within the speech of individual speaker(s) (Bell, 1997, p. 240; Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998, p. 214), therefore demands the examination of a range of interactional factors situated in the broader social context that may affect variant use, such as audience, topic, setting, and more nuanced interactional work, such as framing and personal identity construction (Schilling-Estes, 1998).

In this section, I address quantitative variation in individual speakers in terms of topic and interactional setting. An important aspect of style shifting is that it offers insight into the relationship between linguistic variables and identity, since patterning of variation with different interactional factors relates to speakers’ linguistic self-presentation (Coupland, 2007; Eckert & Rickford, 2001; Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985). Variation between a low, backed /æ/ realization and the raised and fronted general American English variant has been shown to be a stylistically-active feature of Chicano English (Eckert, 2008a) relating to indexed social qualities potentially associated with working-class minority ethnic status, such as toughness and coolness. Topic-related shifting may also pertain to identity in terms of what topics are important to the
speaker and how they relate to the use of marked linguistic features, such as ethnolectal features, since the shifting implies social meaning. If an individual’s vowel realization varies significantly when discussing different interview topics, it may indicate that the variable can be used meaningfully for particular interactional work (for example, affiliation or excitement) or to index meanings of ethnic identity or belonging (Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Schilling-Estes, 2004). For example, Rickford and McNair-Knox (1994) found that “Foxy Boston”, a teenage African-American girl, used significantly more African American Vernacular English morphosyntactic forms when discussing teenage social relations, and less when discussing academic and career topics. Schilling-Estes (2004) showed that African American and Lumbee Indian interview participants in Robeson County, North Carolina, style shifted to align or disalign with each other in relationship to discourse topics relevant to local history and race relations.

Style shifting across different types of interactional encounters also offers productive insight into speakers’ repertoires more broadly. This approach is able to account for social effects that may be meaningful for some speakers, but that may not appear in interview data alone. For example, significant variation between interview and non-interview data may indicate that F1/F2 variation is meaningful in terms of particular associations (formality, etc.) which speakers choose to highlight in different interactional contexts or when addressing different interlocutors, as in Bell’s (1984) finding that speakers shifted between standard and local New Zealand English features to address different face-to-face and perceived (in the case of radio) audiences. This research is particularly important in bilingual communities, where focusing exclusively on any single interaction type may seriously limit observation of the range of
variation that makes up speakers’ multilingual repertoires. For example, in her study of style and social change in the emergent British Asian English dialect, Sharma (2011) found that, in contrast to the apparent shift to British English prestige features observed in young women’s sociolinguistic interviews, the same speakers conserved Punjabi features when speaking in the home domain.

4.2.1 Marcos

Marcos’s linguistic and social background indicates that he could be likely to display stylistic variation, making him a good subject for individual analysis. He has rich linguistic resources, a keen awareness of language as a resource for identity and interactional work, a history of interaction with diverse social groups at different times of his life, and strongly expressed opinions about identity.

Marcos uses /ae/ realizations associated with both the European-American and Latino patterns. He exhibits the Latino pattern overall (an overall lower /ae/ which is lowered and backed in the pre-nasal position, with little pre-nasal and non-nasal distinction), but also demonstrates a broad range of individual /ae/ values in pre-nasal and non-nasal contexts, creating the potential for stylistic variation between more-Latino and more general /ae/ realization.

Marcos speaks English and Spanish fluently and grew up in a bilingual family, but identifies English as his first productive language. This makes it likely that his English will be used for identity work (Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Santa Ana, 1993). He uses both English and Spanish with family, including his young son, and with Latino friends. He speaks English with his European-American wife and in other social domains. He is proud of his linguistic versatility, reporting fluency in both Salvadoran and Mexican Spanish, demonstrating a broad and flexible linguistic repertoire which included Latino English and African American English features, and
demonstrated high metalinguistic awareness, describing himself as a “chameleon” who uses language as an adaptive strategy.

Marcos is a second-generation immigrant of mixed Salvadoran/Mexican heritage, and a native Washingtonian. He grew up in D.C., primarily in one of the original Latino neighborhoods, and he also had frequent contact with African American friends and neighbors throughout his early education. His mother, who worked in domestic service, raised him as a single parent within an extended-family household of relatives. As a child and adolescent, he regularly witnessed street crime and violence, and spent a year in El Salvador as a teenager. He attended a private, majority-white high school through the beneficence of his mother’s employer, after which he joined the Marine Corps. He currently works in an office job.

Marcos is proud of his heritage and D.C. background, and he expressed many opinions about race, class, language, and Washington, D.C. His interview indicated identity construction related to language, personal experience, and social ideology. For example, Marcos is from a working-class family, yet attended an exclusive private school thanks to his mother’s employer. In the interview, he expressed metalinguistic commentary which explicitly referenced his elite secondary education as the motivation for “sounding different, educated”, yet also expressed a strong affiliation with the working-class Latino identity of his childhood, which creates tension with his current middle-income lifestyle. This combination of the linguistic and social factors makes him an interesting candidate for stylistic variation related to identity work.

I used mixed-model regression analysis to test the effects of preceding and following phonetic environment and topic on Marcos’s /æ/ realizations. Independent factors were previous and following phonetic environment, coded as described in chapters 3 and 4, and topic, broadly
defined as stretches of discourse about explicitly articulated themes (Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Tseng, 2011). Statistically significant effects of linguistic environment and topic on /ae/ realization along the F1 and F2 dimensions were identified based on p values of less than 0.05. Individual word was included as a random effect, which strengthens the model’s predictive power and allows it to compensate for the unbalanced distribution of individual lexical items characteristic of naturalistic data sets, revealing patterns for the data as a whole (Johnson, 2009). Comprehensive analysis of all tokens offers an important benefit in that it provides a sense of variation throughout the interviews as holistic interactions, allowing the researcher to observe stretches of data where particular variants may cluster quantitatively in topically related stretches of discourse, rather than the balanced but limited sampling of tokens common in larger-scale variation projects (e.g., Labov, 1966).

Topics emerged from the interview data and were coded based on interview question modules (e.g., language; family; Latino identity; etc.), with the coding expanded as necessary to include topics not included in the modules. The most-frequently discussed topics were selected for analysis as potentially meaningful to the speaker. Marcos’s most frequently discussed topics were changes in Washington, D.C., especially pertaining to gentrification; and demonstrations of general D.C. knowledge and Latino community knowledge, including neighborhoods and childhood experiences.

4.2.2 Analysis

Preceding and following phonetic environment (PFE and FFE, respectively) were found to be significant for F1 and F2 (tables 14 and 15), and topic was significant for F1 (table 14). Significant linguistic factors and conditioning effects were consistent with previous findings.
(Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2009; see section 4.2).

Table 14. F1 All factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent factor</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 FFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>p=9.4x10^{-14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 PFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>p=0.000151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 by topic</td>
<td>p=0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.05

Table 15. F2 All factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent factor</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2 FFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>p=4.26x10^{-13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 PFE by place of articulation</td>
<td>p=6.8x10^{-07}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.05

The most significant factor affecting F1 and F2 was following phonetic environment voicing/manner (p=9.4x10^{-14}; 4.26x10^{-13}), with the strongest effect conditioning /ae/ raising and fronting being following nasals (tables 16 and 17). Voicelessness also conditioned lowering, and fricative manner of articulation conditioned backing, generally consistent with group findings and with Roeder (2006). Preceding place of articulation significantly affected F2 (p=6.8x10^{-07}), with velars and liquids strongly conditioning fronting and backing (table 18). Preceding voicing/manner significantly affected F1 (p=0.000151); voiced fricatives most conditioned raising, and liquids most conditioned lowering (table 19).
### Table 16. F1 Following phonetic environment (FFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>-88.235</td>
<td>685.784</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>8.019</td>
<td>780.190</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>9.530</td>
<td>782.379</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>30.185</td>
<td>778.474</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>40.502</td>
<td>775.517</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\rho=9.4\times10^{-14}$

### Table 17. F2 Following phonetic environment (FFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>174.400</td>
<td>1982.320</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>9.199</td>
<td>1810.845</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>-54.683</td>
<td>1745.692</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>-61.150</td>
<td>1753.905</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>-67.766</td>
<td>1718.561</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\rho=4.26\times10^{-13}$

### Table 18. F2 Preceding phonetic environment (PFE) by place of articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>101.081</td>
<td>1948.688</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H or pause</td>
<td>21.380</td>
<td>1828.425</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apical</td>
<td>13.254</td>
<td>1769.342</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labial</td>
<td>-9.317</td>
<td>1813.296</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td>-127.117</td>
<td>1628.286</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\rho=6.8\times10^{-07}$

### Table 19. F1 Preceding phonetic environment (PFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>-62.280</td>
<td>748.203</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>-5.679</td>
<td>704.045</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H or pause</td>
<td>-1.752</td>
<td>757.890</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>752.000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>805.893</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>13.389</td>
<td>779.542</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td>47.326</td>
<td>855.571</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\rho=0.000151$
Marcos demonstrated a statistically significant shift in /ae/ F1 realization when discussing change in the city versus general D.C. knowledge and other topics, such as his military service (p=0.008, table 14). His average /ae/ realization was lowest when discussing change in D.C. (table 20). This can also be seen in figure 8, where his F1 average is much larger, indicating lower /ae/ realization, in the change in D.C. topic in comparison with other topics and with his overall interview average. Since low, back /ae/ in Chicano English has been found to index social meanings such as localness, toughness, and coolness associated with Latino and ethnic-minority group membership (Eckert, 1996, 2008a), Marcos’s /ae/ usage may relate to similar meanings that are relevant in a D.C. context, particularly in terms of change and gentrification. In the following chapter, I will look at this potential relationship more closely, focusing on qualitative variant patterning and discursive identity construction in Marcos’s speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-13.154</td>
<td>755.504</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>755.060</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>13.327</td>
<td>773.315</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.00
4.2.3 Candida

In this section, I present the results of quantitative variation analysis applied to Candida’s self-recordings in three different interactional settings: a sociolinguistic interview conducted by me; a conversation while walking in a park with a friend, who is a non-Hispanic immigrant of Afro-Caribbean descent; and at her part-time job at a clothing donation organization. The interview and work recordings were each approximately one hour in length; the park interaction was three hours long. While two participants, Candida and Hector, self-recorded data in a range of non-interview contexts, I chose to focus on Candida as Hector’s non-interview data yielded few usable vowel tokens due to environmental noise.

Candida is a native speaker of both English and Spanish. She speaks Spanish with her parents and Spanish and English with her younger siblings. Candida is a working-class second-generation Mexican American immigrant who resides in the suburbs. She is academically oriented, and her interest in social sciences contributed to her decision to record herself for this study. She considers herself a “bad Latina” due to her non-traditional interests, but has many
Latino friends. At the time of our interview, she was enrolled in community college and had been accepted at a large public university.

4.2.4 Analysis

I used mixed-model regression analysis to test the effects of preceding and following phonetic environment and interaction type against Candida’s /ae/ realization. Independent factors were previous and following phonetic environment, and interactional setting. Statistically significant effects of linguistic environment and interactional type on /ae/ realization along the F1 and F2 dimensions were identified based on p values of less than 0.05. Individual word was again included as a random effect. Table 21 presents these results.

Table 21. F1 All factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent factor</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 by interactional setting</td>
<td>p=2.07x10^{-22}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 FFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>p=0.00592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 FFE by place of articulation</td>
<td>p=0.0165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at p<0.05

Table 22. F2 All factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent factor</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2 by interactional setting</td>
<td>p=3.97x10^{-20}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 FFE by voicing/manner</td>
<td>p=4.83x^{-08}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 FFE by place of articulation</td>
<td>p=0.000878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at p<0.05

Interactional setting was found to be significant for Candida’s /ae/ variation along F1 and F2 (p=2.07x10^{-22}; 3.97x10^{-20}). I will return to a discussion of this in the following section.

Significant linguistic factors and conditioning effects were broadly consistent with previous findings (Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2009; see
section 4.2). Following phonetic environment significantly affected /ae/ realization, with following voicing/manner and place of articulation influencing F2 (p=4.83x10^{-08}, 0.000878) more strongly than F1 (p=0.00592, 0.0165). Conditioning effects within these findings (tables 23-26) showed that following nasal environment had the strongest conditioning effect, influencing /ae/ fronting and raising. Following velar and labial environments conditioned fronting and backing, respectively, and voicelessness and fricative manner of articulation tended to condition lowering and backing. However, one difference was observed in F1 following voicing and manner, in which voiced stops conditioned lowering and voiceless stops somewhat conditioned raising. Previous research and findings predict that voicing conditions raising; the different pattern here may possibly be attributable to preceding phonetic environment. Candida’s low /ae/ realization following voiced stops is consistent with her overall average for /ae/ in non-nasal contexts (approximately 803 Hertz). Following voiced stops often co-occurred with preceding /h/ environment in Candida’s data (e.g. “had”). Since preceding /h/ famously has little influence on following vowel realization (Hodge et al., 2004), Candida’s low /ae/ in this context may simply reflect a lack of preceding linguistic environment conditioning affects. Similarly, the slight raising effect observed with voiceless stops may be due to the effect of preceding voiced fricatives (e.g. “that”).

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{v}} The verb “have” was included in this study when used as a main verb, not as an auxiliary verb, since in the auxiliary form it is susceptible to weakening (Ortiz Lira, 2008).\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{v}} The accented determiner or “strong form” of “that” was included in this study; the conjunction and relative pronoun “weak forms” were excluded (Ortiz Lira, 2008).\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{x}} It should be reiterated here that mixed-model regression modeling compensates for unbalances of this sort in natural data sets, so that the statistical significance of factors is reliable despite this lexical effect (Johnson, 2009). As a whole, coefficient rankings as well as significance of linguistic factors in my study are consistent within and across speakers, and consistent with previous research (Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Labov, 1994; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2009).
Table 23. F2 Following phonetic environment (FFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>243.849</td>
<td>2079.963</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>1815.409</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>-48.595</td>
<td>1694.610</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>-93.728</td>
<td>1663.385</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>-104.176</td>
<td>1711.061</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=4.83x10^-8

Table 24. F2 Following phonetic environment (FFE) by place of articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>111.528</td>
<td>1867.947</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apical</td>
<td>-35.968</td>
<td>1767.503</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labial</td>
<td>-75.560</td>
<td>1678.736</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.000878

Table 25. F1 Following phonetic environment (FFE) by voicing/manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>-69.308</td>
<td>723.630</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>-10.211</td>
<td>742.592</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>787.932</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>36.744</td>
<td>803.136</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>42.868</td>
<td>820.000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.00592

Table 26. F1 FFE by place of articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFE</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apical</td>
<td>-31.126</td>
<td>743.629</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>-7.605</td>
<td>771.421</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labial</td>
<td>38.126</td>
<td>797.517</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.0165
Table 27 below presents significant findings by interactional setting. As noted above, Candida demonstrated statistically significant shifts in /æ/ realization by interactional context; F1 was more strongly affected than F2 (p=2.07x10^{-22}; 3.97x10^{-20}).

Table 27. F1 by interactional setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F1</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>-158.494</td>
<td>555.364</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>75.359</td>
<td>778.000</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>83.135</td>
<td>783.364</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=2.07x10^{-22}

Table 28. F2 by interactional setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Coefficient value</th>
<th>Mean F2</th>
<th>N tokens</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>147.004</td>
<td>1809.337</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>105.639</td>
<td>1719.543</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>-252.643</td>
<td>1341.318</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=3.97x10^{-20}

The interactional context with the strongest effect was “job”, which conditioned raising and backing (tables 27 and 28). Conversation in the park somewhat conditioned low /æ/, and the interview context conditioned fronted /æ/. These findings indicate stylistic variation for /æ/ along F1 and F2 in different interactional contexts, suggesting that different /æ/ realizations may be preferred in different types of social encounter. This potentially relates to associations of more ethnolectal or more general realizations with ideologies of markedness and linguistic correctness. Discrimination against ethnic-associated and non-standard “vernacular” forms of language is well documented (Alim & Smitherman, 2012; Labov, 2001a, 2007; Lippi-Green, 2011; Purnell, Idsardi, & Baugh, 1999; Rickford, 1999). General American English, unlike dialects considered to be “ethnic” or “non-standard”, is typically considered to be unmarked and is privileged by
lack of overt stigma and by associations of linguistic correctness (Lippi-Green, 1997; Bucholtz, 2001). Further, general American English can be marked at the local level through contrast with minority-group forms (Eckert, 2008a). The presence of lowness and backing as a stylistic variable which contrasts with general American English realizations in Chicano English, implies that Candida’s stylistic /ae/-shifting may relate to agentive identity work such as self-presentation which draws on social associations and notions of “correctness” or register in different interactional contexts and genres, for example, the use of low /ae/ in the more relaxed environment of conversation with a friend, and less-ethnolectal /ae/ raising and fronting in more formal job and interview settings. However, Candida also backs /ae/ in her job setting, lending support to the idea that F1 and F2 can operate independently and possibly have different stylistic uses and meanings (Eckert, 2008a; Fought, 2003). This finding raises intriguing possibilities for future analysis.

4.2.5 Discussion

The effects of linguistic factors on Marcos and Candida’s /ae/ realizations were consistent with larger-group findings in this study, and with previous research. Preceding and following phonetic environment significantly affected variation, with factor significance conditioning effects generally consistent with previous findings (section 4.2; Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2009). Following nasal environment conditioned vowel raising and fronting, though both Candida and Marcos show the weaker nasal-raising pattern characteristic of Latino English varieties (section 4.2, p. 99; Eckert, 2008a; Fought, 2003; Thomas, 2001). Taken together, this indicates that Candida and Marcos are speaking native English with /ae/ realization more similar to the Chicano English than general American English pattern.
In terms of social factors, both Marcos and Candida showed quantitative evidence of style shifting. Marcos shifted styles by topic, while Candida shifted by interactional setting. Marcos demonstrated a statistically-significant shift in /ae/ F1 realization by discourse topic. He was most likely to use lower /ae/ when discussing change in the city, and most likely to use more raised /ae/ when discussing topics which did not relate to D.C. Topics emerged from the interview, and Marcos’s frequent discussion of change in the city and of D.C. in general during the interview indicates that these topics are meaningful to him. It seems that for Marcos, /ae/ is stylistically useful along F1: different /ae/ realizations may be available for more nuanced identity work, with Marcos’s use of lower tokens potentially relating to his position on change and gentrification and his ethnic associations. In short, the finding that Marcos’ /ae/ realization varies significantly by topic, becoming lower (more “ethnolectal”) when discussing change and gentrification, indicates that the variant may be stylistically active, and that its usage and meaning may be related to speaker attitudes towards these topics. These attitudes will be unpacked in the qualitative analysis in the next chapter.

Candida demonstrated a statistically-significant shift in /ae/ F1 and F2 realization by interactional setting. Her /ae/ variation was most strongly conditioned by the “job” setting, which conditioned raising and backing. She was most likely to use low /ae/ when conversing in a park with a friend, and fronted /ae/ in the sociolinguistic interview. These findings suggest that different /ae/ realizations may be preferred in different types of social encounter; more ethnolectal or more general realizations may be associated with different broadly-circulated language attitudes of discrimination that stigmatize ethnic and vernacular forms and privilege less-marked (“more correct”) general American English varieties. The presence of lowness and
backing as a stylistic variable that contrasts with general American English realizations in Chicano English implies its indexical potential. Candida’s stylistic /ae/-shifting may also be related to identity or self-presentation, perhaps varying with formality in different interactional contexts and genres. In sum, then, it appears that /ae/ variation is stylistic, that it can be conditioned by interaction type, and that it may be influenced by ideas of linguistic appropriateness in different encounters or by identity work and self-presentation. The raising and backing of /ae/ in the “job” setting, rather than raising and fronting as in the general American pattern, lends support to the idea that F1 and F2 can operate independently and possibly have different stylistic meanings which remain to be investigated (Eckert, 2008a; Fought, 2003). Candida’s style shifting raises intriguing possibilities for future analysis and highlights the important benefits of obtaining data from diverse recording contexts, including interactional settings and interlocutors.

The results of my intra-speaker variation analysis indicate that Candida and Marcos both display an /ae/ realization similar to the Chicano English pattern, as did the majority of speakers in this study. Stylistic variation by topic and interactional setting suggest that variation within speakers’ /ae/ realizations may be an available resource for stylistic identity construction, with usage patterns potentially related to language attitudes and associations with more “ethnic” or “general” realizations. This highlights the need for detailed, small-scale research to gain insight into uses of variation that may inform larger patterns and provide directions for future research. Significant results for particular topics indicate that F1 variation may be meaningful in terms of particular aspects of identity. Marcos used a significantly lower /ae/ realization when discussing his knowledge of D.C. and changes in the city. Given much previous research on the association
of different non-standard dialects and bilingual practices with social in-groups (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982), Marcos’ pattern may relate to associations of the low, backed ethnolectal variant with Latino or non-white ethnicity and related indexical meanings of coolness, toughness, or local D.C. identity (Eckert, 1996, 2008a), an argument which I will explore further in chapter 5 to follow. Similarly, Candida’s significant variation between different contexts indicates that F1/F2 variation may be meaningful in terms of particular associations or registers highlighted in different interactional contexts, such as more ethnolectal or “vernacular” features in casual conversation, and more general American English features in the workplace due to associations of formality (Labov, 1972a). Candida’s use of raised and backed /æ/ realizations in the workplace indicates that F1 and F2 may be able to operate independently (Eckert, 2008a; Fought, 2003). Marcos also shows significant variation along F1 by topic, though not along F2. While the quantitative patterns I have described in this chapter cannot in themselves account for social meanings, the variation I have described in different interactional contexts, as well as the correlation between variation and particular topics, indicates that stylistic variation related to identity is indeed a fruitful direction for qualitative discourse analysis, which I will discuss next in chapter 5. The analysis will examine Marcos’ use of /æ/ variation and selected non-standard linguistic features in interactional identity construction.

4.3 Chapter Summary

This small-group, single-variable study does not attempt to generalize about the emergence of a D.C. Latino English variety. However, findings suggest a pattern consistent with previous dialectological and sociolinguistic research, which a larger-scale study could productively investigate in future. Detailed examination of a smaller group of speakers, such as
that examined in this dissertation, allows for more complete understanding of the role of individuals within group patterns than do the larger-scale projects traditionally favored by sociolinguistic research. The detailed level of variation analysis permitted by small-scale projects provides important insight into the usage and potential social meanings of /ae/. Small-group studies that triangulate complementary methodological approaches are essential in understanding not only the external linguistic and social factors affecting variable patterning, but also its stylistic potential, which in turn may provide directions for future investigation. In the next chapter, this analysis will be complemented by qualitative discourse analysis.

Again, this dissertation addresses two research questions:

1) How does /ae/, a phonological feature showing a well-documented distinction between Chicano English and general American English varieties, vary in the English of Washington, D.C. Latinos?

2) How does /ae/ variation contribute to stylistic variation and interactional construction of identity in sociolinguistic interviews and other interactional contexts?

Quantitative findings showed /ae/ to vary along linguistic and social dimensions for speakers as a group and for individuals. Preceding and following linguistic environment significantly affected vowel raising and fronting, and lowering and backing. Following phonetic environment had the strongest effect, with conditioning effects generally consistent with previous research on general American and Chicano English (Eckert, 2008a; Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Jones, 2003; Labov, 1994; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2006, 2009; Thomas, 2001). The majority of speakers showed a weaker nasal-raising pattern consistent with Chicano rather than general American English. Adherence to American English phonotactic
rules, as described above, indicates that speakers’ low, backed /æ/ is a systemic feature of a
native English system, not non-native English. This interpretation is supported by speakers’
phonemic distinction between /æ/ and /ɛ/, which is one key means of distinguishing between
Latino English varieties and non-native English (Fought, 2003).

These findings indicate that similar linguistic processes may be at work in the speech of
first- and second-generation D.C. Latinos as those which influenced Chicano English, leading to
the incorporation of substrate-origin non-standard /æ/ into a native English system. The
similarity between /æ/ in this study and in Chicano English lends support to the idea that the
less-split nasal pattern with lower, backed /æ/ may relate to substrate influence. Since Spanish
lacks a comparable low, front vowel, the commonality of Spanish as a substrate language may
produce similar phonological effects on the native English speech varieties which can emerge in
communities of diverse Latino backgrounds (Eckert, 2008a; also see Hoffman & Walker, 2010
on Italian). This study therefore contributes to an important gap in research on ethnolectal
development: “studies often have difficulty in tracing ethnically marked differences in linguistic
behavior directly to the substrate language” (Hoffman & Walker, 2010, p. 42; also see Labov,
2008). However, more extensive research is necessary to extend findings and to determine the
specific processes of feature transfer and acquisition in situations of inter-generational
bilingualism. Expanded research addressing multi-feature phonological variation in a larger data
set is also needed in order to explore the possibility of emergent Latino English varieties in the
Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. This study also highlights the need for more research on
varieties of Latino English that may arise in understudied U.S. Latino communities.
Speaker residence significantly affected F1, with suburban residence conditioning lower /ae/ realization than D.C. proper. This pattern corresponds to gentrification-related residency changes in D.C. that have shifted those speakers most likely to develop ethnolectal language features – working-class immigrants with primarily ethnic-group social networks and strong ethnic orientations – to the suburbs, while urban residents reported more diverse social networks, which are typically associated with broader linguistic repertoires (Sharma, 2011). Individual differences indicated that social contact, access to different varieties, and identity (for example, metalinguistic awareness) influenced speakers’ language behavior (Carter, 2007; Gordon, 2000; Rickford, 1985; Santa Ana, 1993). These findings highlight the importance of smaller studies and the level of detailed individual analysis they make possible. Larger-scale research could build on these findings, perhaps expanding the focus to variation by suburb or city residence, and exploring residency and social networks in the expanded research sites.

These findings highlight the influence of social context in understanding systemic language patterns and language development. Findings from this study emphasize the need to take dynamic factors such as residency into account in explanations of linguistic variation, in addition to traditional social-group identifiers such as race and sex. Findings also point to the relationship between local language practices and broader social and economic trends. Suburb or city residence in D.C. relates to dynamic local processes of gentrification and population displacement. Individual differences highlight the importance of group and individual social interactions and personal histories in systemic language patterns. In short, these findings show that social factors can influence variation in more complex ways than category-correlation, and they highlight the importance of grounding interpretations of linguistic behavior in locally
relevant social and interactional processes, rather than reducing social identity to a series of etic
categories.

Finally, findings also emphasize the relationship between language and society, and the
relevance of local variation to the broader social context. As U.S. demographics continue to
diversify and migrant settlement patterns shift, suburbs are increasingly diverse (Frey, 2015).
This study’s findings indicate directions for comparative research on developing Latino and
other immigrant communities in suburban and city contexts. This in turn has implications for
linguistic discrimination, social justice, and educational equity, as non-standard and ethnolectal
language practices tend to be misunderstood as incorrect, uneducated, or learner English. Greater
understanding of language variation in the increasingly diverse suburbs can have a real impact on
public awareness and the educational experiences of new generations of Americans.

Intra-speaker analysis showed stylistic /ae/ variation by topic and interactional setting,
with usage patterns potentially related to language attitudes and associations with more “ethnic”
or more “general” realizations. Significant results for particular topics indicate that F1 variation
may be meaningful in terms of particular aspects of identity. Marcos used a significantly lower
/ae/ realization when discussing changes in D.C., including gentrification, and a higher
realization when discussing non-D.C. related topics. Candida used low /ae/ in conversation with
a friend, while her /ae/ realization was significantly raised and backed in her workplace
interactions. This may relate to well-documented language attitudes that stigmatize ethnolectal
and “vernacular” features, or limit their use to casual and intimate contexts, and associate more
“standard” realizations with linguistic correctness and with more formal contexts (Alim &
Marcos’ and Candida’s stylistic /ae/ variation is consistent with previous research on variation and social meaning as described above. These potential social meanings make sense in the D.C. context, where race and ethnicity are highlighted facets of identity thanks to the gentrification of the area and the widespread displacement of minority residents. Eckert (2011) notes that situations of social contact and conflict tend to highlight language as part of identity construction. There may also be a unifying force in “Latino” as an identity, shaped by speakers’ common experience with US race ideologies and discrimination irrespective of individual backgrounds. While /ae/ variation may be associated with ethnocultural practices, however, this does not mean that its use directly signals ethnic identity. For example, Candida’s /ae/-shifting may be better explained by language attitudes of (in)correctness which attach to vernaculars and ethnolects, than by any account of “ethnic identity display” per se. In the following chapter, I conduct a qualitative case study that focuses on Marcos’s interactive identity construction and the particular social and interactive meanings which may influence his /ae/ patterns; however, more research will be necessary to expand stylistic analysis and substantiate potential social meanings of /ae/ variation among D.C.-area Latinos.

These findings indicate that speakers may make use of vowel realization along the F1 and F2 dimensions salient in conveying social meaning (Krauss & Pardo, 2006, p. 12), and in turn imply that /ae/ variation may be available for identity construction purposes. These dimensions are particularly relevant in describing the contrast between raised, fronted American English pre-nasal patterns, and low, backed Latino English tendencies, which gives /ae/ variation the
potential to enact meaningful (if not necessarily conscious) practices of self-expression. Findings further indicate that F1 and F2 may operate separately in terms of social meaning, since Marcos lowered but did not back /ae/ significantly when discussing change in D.C. versus other topics, and Candida’s /ae/ realization was both raised and backed in her workplace interactions. As Eckert (2001) and Fought (2003) also note, this suggests an intriguing direction for future research.

Findings show that /ae/ variation may hold stylistic potential for some speakers. This in turn implies that the incorporation of transfer-origin features into emergent linguistic repertoires in bilingual contexts may be mediated by social factors, including language access and language attitudes. This highlights the need for detailed, small-scale research to gain insight into individual variation, which may inform larger patterns and provide directions for future research.

In sum, quantitative findings and qualitative patterning suggest that the non-standard variant, associated in other research with Latino English varieties, is present in my speaker sample and is not a consequence of non-native English but rather a systemic part of speakers’ native English repertoires. Analysis indicates that individual variation may be related to language access via elite educational institutions, and identity factors including but not limited to ethnic orientation. Findings suggest that the variant may be available for stylistic use related to interactional setting and to particular topics which are locally and personally relevant, such as change in D.C. The individual differences suggest that the social meanings of /ae/ may potentially relate to ethnic group associations, and to locally and interactionally important identity work. This study thus gives broader insights into cultural psychology and language and identity as highlighted in a time of contact and tension in Washington, D.C. (Eckert, 2011), and
it provides insight into the relationships between language structure, social factors, and personal identificational concerns.

Individual speaker analysis indicated that social contact, identity, and interactional factors potentially relating to identity construction (Rickford, 1985) played a role in variation. While I have focused on quantitative analysis in this chapter, style and identity work relates not only to quantitative correlations between variation and broad interactional factors, but is also enacted through discourse moves in themselves (Coupland, 2007). Style research thus also requires qualitative analysis (Coupland, 2007; Hay & Drager, 2012; Johnstone, 2006; Podesva, 2007), which can examine the use of different linguistic features while enacting fine-grained interactional work related to self-presentation. In the following chapter, I examine Marcos’s use of low and backed /æ/ as he constructs a local, minority Washingtonian identity against a backdrop of gentrification, providing more insight into the relationship between D.C. Latino /æ/ variation, social context, and group and individual identity.
CHAPTER 5: QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I address the second research question: how does /ae/ variation relate to style and interactive identity construction? To do so, I draw on discourse analysis and the patterning of sociophonetic features to illuminate Marcos’s linguistic construction of an authentic, local Washingtonian identity. This approach to style has been shown to be productive by researchers such as Coupland (2007) and Podesva (2007, 2011). I begin by accounting for Marcos’s selection for this case study and describing the subset of his /ae/ tokens under investigation and their discursive use. While previous research on the stylistic potential of Latino English /ae/ has focused on pre-nasal lowering and backing (Eckert, 1996), I examine stylistic use of pre-nasal and non-pre-nasal /ae/, since both were lowered and backed relative to European American Washingtonians, both for Marcos in particular and for the group of Latino participants in general.

I then provide close discourse analysis of an interview excerpt in which Marcos undertakes much identity work. This excerpt was selected based on dense clusters of low and backed /ae/ and constellation of these vowel tokens with other phonetic features and with person reference. I will describe these features more in this chapter. I first present the co-distribution of person reference patterns in this excerpt as a means of examining discursive we- and they-group formation across interactional time, and I examine how these reference patterns co-occur with low and backed /ae/ and other Latino English and African American English features from Marcos’s linguistic repertoire. I next use detailed discourse analysis of the excerpt to show how

---

3 While it lies beyond the scope of this dissertation, a future study using similar principled discourse analytic methods to study raised and fronted /ae/ would be a productive point of comparison.
these we/they groups are positioned in relation to each other using attributed characteristics and behavior, and I examine the interviewee’s stancework towards these attributed qualities. Stance is defined following Du Bois (2007) as acts of evaluation, conveyed directly or indirectly, which give insight into speakers’ beliefs through expressing judgements, emotions, and knowledge, and which inherently position speakers in relationship to other discourse characters, interactional participants, and ideologies. I identify stances based on speaker expressions of evaluation, including expressions of affect, contextualization cues such as repetition and increased volume, and expressions of speaker certainty.

Positioning is a productive construct for apprehending speaker identity, as it focuses on speakers’ construction of relationships between self and other on multiple interactional levels, including through evaluation of “stance objects” such as social ideologies (De Fina, 2013a; Du Bois, 2007). In this dissertation, I address speaker positioning on three levels as identified by Bamberg (1997). While these levels were originally developed in reference to narrative, I extend them here to non-narrative discourse to give insight into the identity construction Marcos enacts using /æ/ in argumentative discourse, and the social meanings that might attach to this variable. I use positioning to address the interviewee’s orientation to other discourse characters and stance objects, including the Washingtonians and gentrifiers he presents in his interview; the interlocutor to whom his discourse is directed (namely me); and the broader concepts of people and belonging that are invoked in his speech (for example, who belongs in Washington, D.C.). I then show how the production of individual low and backed /æ/ tokens aligns with these discourse patterns and, at the same time, constellates with other canonical features of Latino English such as raising of /ɪ/ (“bit”) towards /i/ (“beet”); trilled /r/; and syllable timing (Bayley &
Santa Ana, 2004; Fought, 2003; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Santa Ana, 1992), and an important African American English feature, /ay/ monophthongization (“I’m” realized as “Ah’m”). I conclude with a discussion of these integrated discourse and phonetic patterns as features of identity work in stylistic self- and other-representation, and I consider the implications of these findings for Marcos’s expression of a particular, local D.C. identity, and for the social meaning of Latino English /ae/ more broadly.

5.1 MARCOS

For an individual case study of stylistic /ae/ variation, I chose to look at Marcos’s speech based on the quantitative evidence of identity work related to /ae/ variation, and based on the social and linguistic factors described in chapter 4. Marcos has a rich linguistic repertoire, which includes the varietal features described above. He also has a high degree of metalinguistic awareness, describing himself as a “linguistic chameleon” who uses language and dialectal variation strategically for interactional purposes.

As his Pillai scores revealed in chapter 4, Marcos’s pre-nasal and non-nasal /ae/ is much less split than the European American pattern. His /ae/ averages in both positions are lower and further back than Washingtonian European American men (table 29).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1 (Hz)</th>
<th></th>
<th>F2 (Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcos</td>
<td>EA men</td>
<td>Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æn/</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marcos’ vowel space (figures 9 and 10) shows much token overlap between pre-nasal and non-nasal /ae/. Individual /ae/ distribution shows tokens that are lower than /ɑ/ and /ɔ/ (which appear to be merged), and some tokens are backed into this space. However, Marcos also shows a range of F1 and F2 realizations and some more extreme realizations, particularly with non-nasal F1 and with /ae/ backing generally. This broad range indicates stylistic potential, as tokens towards the edge of a speaker’s vowel space are likely to carry increased stylistic meaning (Hofwegen, 2013; Podesva, 2011).

![Figure 9. Marcos’s vowel space: Averages](image-url)
Figure 10. Marcos’s vowel space: Individual tokens

Table 30. Marcos’s F1 and F2 range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F1 difference</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F2 difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-nasal /aen/</td>
<td>470-951</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1589-2455</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-nasal /ae/</td>
<td>374-1065</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>1032-2513</td>
<td>1481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 THE VARIABLE

The sociophonetic analysis of /æ/ in Marcos’s speech investigated the distribution of a subset of lowered and backed tokens within a segment of his sociolinguistic interview where discursive identity construction is prominent. These tokens fell outside of one standard deviation from Marcos’s /æ/ mean, at a confidence interval of 68%. Tokens were identified along F1 or F2 dimensions, following previous research indicating that these dimensions may operate independently in terms of style (Eckert, 1996; Fought, 2003). This means that tokens identified as “low” fell into the lowest 14% of Marcos’s /æ/ realizations, and tokens identified as “backed” fell into the most-backed 14% of realizations. These tokens were selected for stylistic analysis given previous research that “vowel stylization more readily occurs for vowels on the periphery of the vowel space” (Hofwegen, 2013, n.p.; also see Kiesling, 2012; Podesva, 2011).

Throughout Marcos’s interview, he used low and backed /æ/ when describing pre-gentrification D.C. and when recalling D.C. values and culture. Clusters of these extreme realizations cross quantitative topic boundaries and constellate with other non-standard features in Marcos’s linguistic repertoire. The following example gives an example of this sociophonetic patterning with discursive work. Marcos produces several tokens of low and backed /æ/ while describing the hazards of old D.C.: prostitution, substance dealing, and abuse (lines 1-11). Against this backdrop, he also describes the presence of values such as respect for elders and strong family bonds among the pre-gentrification community. The D.C. of the eighties is described as a presence in itself—a moral center of values (Falconi, 2011) that motivated Marcos’s family to reform (lines 17-29). His productions of low and backed /æ/ figure in his discursive construction of an imagined community (Anderson, 1983) of Washingtonians.
grounded in place identity (a theme which I will return to in the analysis below in more detail).

Although this study focuses on /æ/, I observed that his speech contained other features documented in Latino English and other varieties of American English. For example, Marcos used the Latino English features of syllable timing and trilled /r/ (Fought, 2003), and features associated with African American English such as monophthongal /ay/, which has been documented as a feature appearing in Southern African American English in all phonetic contexts, although it is more common in non-pre-voiceless contexts (Fridland, 2003; Thomas, 2007); r-deletion, str palatalization, /θ/ fortition, and /l/ vocalization (Edwards, 2008; Thomas, 2007). /l/ vocalization is considered strongly indicative of African American English (Thomas, 2007); while the other features are found in other dialects, such as Southern White English, for Marcos, who reported long-term connections with African Americans in his community, they are almost certainly associated with African American English rather than with Southern White varieties. I therefore refer to these features as such. No evidence of /ay/ monophthongization was observed in European American Washingtonians from the LCDC corpus. Example one below gives an example of the patterning of low and backed /æ/ and monophthongal /ay/ in Marcos’ speech.

*Example 1*

1) Marcos  Yeah, it's- see it was, looked up- I don't know like um,
2)        Saw this thing about Richard Pryor and HIS grandmother coming in and he had this FULL respect about the grandmother and this and that turns out she was a [madam], [low /æ/]
3) Amelia  Mm.
4) Marcos  She ran a brothel, their home was a brothel that was uh, there was always, men walking in and out of the home,  
5)        [That] was [my] home.
[low back /æ/][monophthongal /aɪ/]
6) That was what [I] saw.
   [monophthongal /aɪ/]

7) Amelia Mmhmm.
8) Marcos And uh- not the prostitution but, it was drugs.
9) Amelia Yeah. Yeah.
10) Marcos And I didn't know.
11) You know it- you just knew there was a lot of sign of resPECT and this and [that].
   [low back /æ/]
12) But then we cleaned UP.
13) Uh, the EIGHTIES came and, LITERALLY the Eighties was a transformation of, cleaning UP the neighborhood.
14) This is NOT the way to do things.
15) So, where MY family went is they went into the church.
16) Amelia Mmhmm.
17) Marcos And they let go of, the drugs and the alcohol and the smoking,
18) and, they realized "Oh my God I [AM] an alcoholic I'm getting older there needs [low back /æ/]
to be a better way of life," and they found, the Church.
19) Amelia Mmhmm.
20) Marcos You know [I] was born, on, our- the, twenty-eighth, is the feast of Saint Mark.
   [monophthongal /aɪ/]
21) Amelia Oh okay.
22) Marcos [I'm], named Marcos.
   [monophthongal /aɪ/]
23) Amelia (hhhh) Yeah.
24) Marcos So, my [family] changed. They were already changing and they wanted to be [low/æ/]
better.
25) Amelia Mmhmm.
26) Marcos You know so, but that was brought and infused to them, [by] D.C.
   [monophthongal /aɪ/]
27) D.C. is what wanted to make them BETTER and- and,
28) wanting to be better people and- and individuals so to see it go DOWN,
29) Amelia Uuhh.
30) Marcos That would- that HURT.

It is notable that, while the /ay/ tokens in this excerpt occur in words likely to exhibit vocalic reduction, they also occur at identity-relevant discursive moments such as highlighting change in Marcos’s family, represented by a change from disreputable behavior to naming him
after a saint, to position D.C. as a positive place. Fuller forms such as monophthongal “try” were also observed in the interview (“You know those were the things that were- I miss from D.C./And that's what we [try] to celebrate here in the area, lines 168-169). The example above also shows the characteristic interactional work that Marcos performs as he describes his knowledge of old D.C., positioning himself as an established, long-term resident with extensive experience and knowledge of the city. This theme of knowledge based on personal experience and knowledge of the privations of pre-gentrification D.C. continues throughout Marcos’s interview, and it is one of the central elements I focus on in the analysis below. In the following discussion, I show how sociophonetic patterning and discursive identity construction come together in an argument for belonging and authenticity, supporting the legitimacy of Marcos’ claim to D.C. as a contested social place.

5.3 Analysis

In this chapter, I provide a close analysis of identity construction and variable use in a ten-minute stretch of discourse extracted from Marcos’s interview. This excerpt has a higher rate of low (15%) or backed (17%) /æ/ tokens than the interview averages (13% and 12%, respectively). The distribution of low and backed tokens throughout the interview is shown in figures 12 and 13 below.

In this excerpt, Marcos is responding to my remark that a Washingtonian friend commented that D.C. has been improved “for everyone else”. (A full transcript of the excerpt is provided in Appendix C, where my initial remark and Marcos’s response are indicated with alphabetized lines, and the lines under analysis in this chapter are indicated with line numbers.) By attributing reported speech to a Latino Washingtonian friend who, like Marcos, grew up in
Columbia Heights, and then by expanding the attribution to other interview participants, I invited a discussion of gentrification, stating: “He said ‘You know the thing is, with gentrification and stuff’, a bunch of people said this, they were like ‘You know, we wanted it to get better. We just didn't think we'd be out- we'd, get left out of it. Like, we wanted it to get BETter this neighborhood used to be TERRible. We're GLAD it's getting better we just didn't realize that it was gonna be better for somebody, else.’ You know?”

Throughout my utterance, Marcos responded with backchanneling and affirmations (“mmhmm,” “yes”, “that’s where I’m at”). He then developed an extended argument about native Washingtonians’ authenticity and their rightful place in the city, as shown in the analysis below. This argument draws on sketches of kinds of people and legitimate behavior, values, and cultural markers. At stake in Marcos’s discursive account is his own legitimacy as a “real Washingtonian”.

In this excerpt, as Marcos describes native Washingtonians’ exclusion from gentrified D.C. and constructs identity categories of “Washingtonian” and “outsider”, his speech displays a constellation of low and backed /æ/ with other Latino English and African American English features. Marcos uses these clusters of sociophonetic features as part of his discursive exploration of themes of belonging and exclusion.

As Marcos described his experience as a native Washingtonian, tokens of sociophonetic features (low and backed /æ/, African American English features, and Latino English features) and person references (personal pronouns “I, we, you, they”, and non-pronominal referents and descriptions such as “mother”, “Washingtonians”, “newcomers”, “people from here”, which were categorized functionally as we- or they-referents; Vladimirou, 2007) revealed clusters in
their patterning throughout the discourse. I then analyzed the characteristics Marcos attributed to
the in-group of native Washingtonians and the out-group of gentrifiers, and examined how these
qualities were used to position these groups in relationship to each other. I then studied the
patterning of /ae/ occurrences with these discourse moves and with other Latino English and
African American English features to motivate a stylistic interpretation of his variable use as part
of identity construction.

I begin by presenting the co-distribution of person reference patterns in this excerpt as a
means of examining (1) discursive we- and they-group formation across interactional time; and
(2) the co-occurrence of this identity construction with low and backed /ae/ and other Latino
English and African American English features. Figures 11-13 below represent person reference
and phonetic tokens across the interview excerpt, measured in transcript line numbers. Figure 11
represents the distribution of all person references across interactional time in the excerpt. This
figure demonstrates that there is much person reference between lines 21 and 100, 121 and 190,
and 210-250. Figure 12 represents the distribution of phonetic features across interactional time,
where “LB” indicates low or backed /ae/ realizations, “LE” indicates Latino English features,
and “AAE” indicates African American English features. This figure demonstrates that low and
backed /ae/, Latino English, and African American English features co-occur, and shows the
frequency of occurrence of each type at different moments in the interview. Figure 13 shows the
overall pattern of person reference and phonetic features. I will discuss this co-occurrence and
break down the tables in the sections to follow.
Figure 11. Distribution of person references in Marcos’s interview excerpt

Figure 12. Distribution of phonetic features of interest in Marcos’s interview excerpt
The co-occurrence of person reference and phonetic features in figure 13 above corresponds with identity-relevant places in the transcript where identity construction takes place using discursive group formation and linguistic repertoire. In table 13, it can be seen that high frequencies of person references, low or backed /æ/, and African American English or Latino English features cluster into three sections, separated by brief transitions with fewer features. These sections roughly correspond to lines 1-120, 121-200, and 201-260 (figure 13), where person references and sociophonetic variation coincide. Since person reference is fundamental to representation of identity, these areas of coincidence suggest stretches of discourse that involve both discursive identity construction and stylistic use of low and backed /æ/. Overall, Marcos’s use of first-person pronouns and we-references is greater than his use of third-person pronouns and they-group references (figure 11), suggesting more focus on in-group than out-group construction. These areas of frequent person reference co-occur with non-standard /æ/
realizations and the use of other non-standard features associated with African American English and Latino English. I describe these patterns in more detail in the analysis below.

Since the coincidence of person reference and sociophonetic patterns in figure 13 above reveals a rough segmentation of the excerpt into three sections, I will analyze each one in turn. In each section, I will begin with discourse analysis, examining person reference patterns within the section and their implications for in- and out-group formation within the interview. I next discuss the discursive positioning of these groups as a form of identity construction, focusing especially on the behaviors, qualities, and values which Marcos attributes to each group, the frequent use of himself and his experiences as an example of in-group qualities, and the implications of his evaluative stancework for level-1 positioning. I will then discuss sociophonetic patterning within each section, first describing the use of non-standard /æ/ and then contextualizing its occurrence in terms of its qualitative patterning with discourse moves, and its quantitative constellation with other non-standard linguistic features of Latino English and African American English. I conclude the analysis of each section with a general discussion about these patterns as part of a broader argument which Marcos is making throughout the excerpt.

5.4 Section 1

1) Marcos  Who can afford that?
2) So YES. Your friend was right.
3) We- we wanted it(.) We want- this place to be better.
4) We WANT D.C. to be better.
5) But I didn't know it was gonna be better for, everyone else.
6) For, for, the, kids, that you know their parents live in Utah.
7) Or Wyoming, and, they send their kids over here.
8) Cause you know, "Oh [go learn about Congress]" and, shit. [syllable timing ]
9) And, NOW they're living here and, >I'm not hating on them.<
10) THAT'S what (claps hands) D.C.'s about.
11) It's a [melting pot].
    [syllable timing]
12) Amelia Mmhmm.
13) Marcos Just SUCKS that we, uh everyone who's, low-income, gets these houses, but they
don't apPREciate it so,
14) THEY'RE also, the CRIMinals and then there's,
15) US, that's in the middle which is a HUGE gap.
16) Amelia Mmhmm.
17) Marcos People that make forty to, a hundred and twenty thousand.
18) Amelia Mmhmm.
19) Marcos That's a [BIG fucking gap].
    [syllable timing]
20) That's a big gap.
21) Marcos WE'RE left out.
22) Amelia Yeah.
23) Marcos I'm here, thirty-six years old, married, both, have, Federal, government
    employees,
    we're both, combination making, making about two hundred thousand, about?
    And, I need to have a roommate because I still can't afford my mortgage.
25) Marcos Yeah. Twelve hundred dollars for daycare a month?
26) Amelia (whistles)
27) Marcos Yeah.
28) Amelia That's a lot.
29) Marcos THOSE should be a mortgage.
30) Amelia Yeah that's a lot of [money for daycare.
31) Marcos [But, it's not.
32) Amelia Because I-I you know, I have to spend [three] thousand on,
    mortgage I have to spend [THREE] hundred on, THIS and you have to do THIS
    and you have,
    [trilled /r/][trilled /r/]
33) It's over a hundred dollars to commute to work it's uh,
34) you have to EAT it's, you know, ten dollars a DAY and, that's just a SANDwich
    and,
35) it SUCKS.
36) Amelia That´s a lot.=
37) Marcos =You know we wanted to make better.
38) Amelia [Yeah.
39) Marcos [You know. But, this took a LOT.
This went to the Marine Corps.

Marcos This was, being, in the weapons platoon, doing, volunteering for, [black] ops [low back /æ/]

just so I can get extra pay.

Ages twenty-one instead of getting rims on my car and, getting a stereo system, I BOUGHT, a home.

And I bought it in Germantown Maryland.

Because there was farmlands up there.

[King's] Farmland, this and that.

And now there's a Mercedes dealership a SmartCar dealership or a Lamborghini dealership,

Amelia Oh (h) really?=

Marcos =I sold it, [I], purchased it for, one thirty-five, [I] sold it for over five hundred?

[monophthongal /ay/] [monophthongal /ay/]

Amelia >Oh my God.<=

Marcos THAT'S where [I] was fortunate.= [monophthongal /ay/]

Amelia =>Wow<.=

Marcos =You know, I- I, I- wasn't STUPID with my money, at an early age.

Because of what I learned in D.C.

Uh- you know I learned morals.

I got my values from here, and they weren't-

YEAH they were, somewhat hustler-ish or street-ish,

WHATEVER. I just learned to take care of my >[FAMILY].< [low /æ/]

Amelia Mmhmmm.

Marcos And to take care of others.

Amelia Mmhmmm.

You know and, and I moved back into D.C. and I bought my mom's home, and,

uh she lives out THERE where,

I had enough money to put into the condo and I sold that and,

met [my] wife and now I live here in Petworth and.

[monophthongal /ay/]

It's because uh- I chose [Petworth and- and I didn't choose like Upper Northwest] because,

[syllable timing]

I believe this is gonna get better and I BELIEVE that my kid can go down the park and be, in a soccer team.

Amelia Yeah.=

Marcos =I don't [have] to BE, off of Sixteenth Street or F, you know, up- up the street on,

[low /æ/]

Marcos You shouldn't have to do that.

You know, I did a lot of community service.
I've PAINTED Malcom- you know, uh, SEVERAL,

Amelia [Mmhmm.]

Marcos [Uh elementary schools?]

Amelia Oh cool.

Marcos These are MARYLAND, fraternities University of Maryland, sororities that you know would come in and [I] would go with THEM.

[monophthongal /ay/]

And, my friends were in college I wasn't but I joined them, to go do community things for here.

Amelia Mmhmm.=

Marcos =>Where's the community people are helping here?<

"Well this ain't my community I'm just here for two years."

Amelia Mmhmm.

Marcos There's a lot of TRANsient people.

So they come here to, take advantage of everything that's given to them, but they don't, contribute.

Amelia Mmhmm.

Marcos Not everyone. But the majority do. DID that.

Amelia But it's like their life isn't part of the community.

Marcos They're- Yeah. "We're just here."

Amelia Yeah.

Marcos "Oh this place sucks" everybody complains well what have you done, to make this place better?

There ARE your few. There ARE. There ARE that m-, have made it better.

I mean [my] friend George he owns uh, [Cashion's], eat and sit place.

[monophthongal /ay/]

[low /ae/]

HE'S lived in D.C. his whole life too.

Amelia Mmhmm.

Marcos And, HE owns the restaurant his brother runs the, the- the kitchen and, you know, they've made the neighborhood BETTER.

They donate money, their TIME.

Amelia That's cool.

Marcos And, we want to make it better.

That's in Adams Morgan.

Amelia Yeah.

Marcos You know. So all these things, you know, we're all here, we're not all, just running away from it.

We want to make it better but, we have to WORK twenty-four seven, and we don't get to enJOY it? [And WE’RE Washingtonians.

Amelia [Mmhmm.

It DOES hurt.

Amelia Yeah that sucks.=

Marcos =You know? It DOES suck.

Amelia Then you see all- and then, yeah you see- you get the kids with the knives and
you're like "Man we're working so hard<, [and it’s, what's- what's it doing"

113) Marcos 
114) >Yeah.< 
115) Like, YOU'RE giving it a bad image. 
116) YOU'RE just here to kind of leech off of it and move on once you leave, 
117) Amelia 
118) Uhuh. 
119) Marcos and go [back to Vermont] or wherever YOU'RE from, 
120) Amelia 
121) Uhuh. 
122) Amelia [syllable timing] 
123) AND, [I'm] stuck here with the trash. 
124) [monophthongal /ay/] 
125) Amelia [monophthongal /ay/] 
126) Marcos [I'm] here with the leftovers. 
127) Amelia Mmhmm.

Figure 14. Person reference and phonetic features in section 1

Personal pronouns and group reference—section 1

Throughout section 1, the most prominent person reference pattern is a progression from pronominal “we” references (lines 1-50), to pronominal “I” references (lines 21-90), then non-pronominal expanded or descriptive “we” referents which are often descriptive, such as “my friend George”, “his brother” (lines 61-120). The overall higher frequency of “we” and “I” terms
offers an indication that Marcos is more focused on in-group than out-group creation in this section. Marcos himself is a major character in the in-group: “I” references occur more frequently than any other person reference term, and as I show below, this is directly related to Marcos’s use of his own experience as an exemplar of authentic D.C. values and behavior.

Despite their lower frequency, “they” references are used as a strategic point of contrast to help define the we-group. For example, in lines 4-8, “they” references refer to “everyone else” (a repetition of my own comment reporting a friend’s assessment that D.C. was improved “for everyone else”), then further narrowed to “kids, that you know their parents live in Utah. Or Wyoming, and, they send their kids over here” (lines 6-8)—outsiders who are othered through association with distant places. The deictic relationship between these rural, western places and “here”—urban D.C.—creates corresponding distance between the groups of outsiders and insiders associated with those places. Similarly, in line 87, “they” refers to transient new residents who don’t invest in the community, contrasting with we-groups used as examples of community participation. Importantly, Marcos names the we-group, explicitly associating it with a place identity—“WE’RE Washingtonians” (line 107)—and employing emphatic stress as a contextualization cue that helps create contrast with an implied “they”, who are not Washingtonians (Gumperz, 1982).

5.4.1 Positioning “us” and “them”—section 1

The in- and out-groups created through person reference are positioned in relationship to each other through the behavior, qualities, and values that Marcos attributes to each. He does this using referential labels (for example, through explicit terms like “transient people”, line 86) or through describing characteristic behavior (“So they come here to, take advantage of everything that's given to them, but they don't, contribute”, line 87). Typically,
these assigned group characteristics are contrastive and gentrifiers are negatively evaluated (for example, they “take” but “don’t contribute”). The contrast between this negative behavior and the positive contributions attributed to Washingtonians, creates oppositional positioning between them in the discourse, or level 1 positioning (Bamberg, 1997). This simultaneously positions Marcos on the interactional level (level 2 positioning), allowing Marcos to present himself to me, his interlocutor, as an authentic, bona fide member of the Washington community with extensive knowledge of Washingtonian norms and community history. In this, he also draws on macrolevel ideologies and level 3 positioning at the level of self and identity. In the following analysis, I focus on the discursive relationship between the in- and out-group in section 1. Implications for level 2 and level 3 positioning will be addressed later in the general discussion, after my analysis of the three segments of the excerpt.

Marcos uses positioning in section 1 to present the “we” in-group as deserving the status of Washingtonians, in contrast to the undeserving “they” out-groups. This moral positioning is part of an argumentative sequence expanding on his claim that “WE’RE left out” (line 21) of the new, prosperous D.C., while outsiders associated with other places are positioned as unfairly benefiting. Next, Marcos articulates social values and behaviors associated with D.C., using himself as an example of in-group behavior and values. As he builds this argument sequence towards its evaluative culmination (“we don't get to enJOY it? And WE’RE Washingtonians. It DOES hurt,” lines 107-109), Marcos uses stancework to evaluate the characteristics he attributes to himself and others.

The in-group is positioned as “in the middle” (line 15), an ambiguous description that reflects the group’s middle-class status as well as its tense position in D.C. In contrast, the out-
groups are described in terms of place and social class, as well as other characteristics. As we have just seen, the first group mentioned consists of D.C.’s new residents or gentrifiers, “kids” from Utah or Wyoming (lines 6-7). These “kids” are presumably wealthy enough for their parents to send them to D.C. The other group specified is “low income”, or residents who qualify for (but don’t appreciate) subsidized housing (lines 13-14). These groups have clear moral associations. Marcos explicitly characterizes the low-income residents pejoratively as “criminals”; his description of the “kids” as “sent by their parents” implies an immaturity and a lack of agency—he presents them as coddled, or at least not self-sufficient.

After positioning the newcomers as outsiders, Marcos states: “I’m not hating on them” (line 9). This colloquial expression indicating lack of judgment pronounces just the sort of negative assessment it purports to refute: it presupposes that there is something about their behavior that is worthy of (negative) judgment. However, by not “hating on them” (when it may be deserved), he positions himself as non-judgmental. He frames this tolerant quality as a fundamental D.C. characteristic: “THAT’s what D.C.’s about. It’s a melting pot” (lines 9-10). Marcos also takes a negative stance towards undeserving low-income residents who “don’t appreciate” the housing provided for them, calling them “criminals”; this stance is further highlighted through emphatic stress (“THEY’RE also the CRIMinals”, line 14). The distance between these out-groups and the we-group of middle-class Washingtonians is also accentuated through repetition (“gap”, lines 15, 17) and stress: “That’s a HUGE gap.” I respond to this emphasis, signaling my understanding of the importance of this gap through further repetition in line 19. This “gap” is specifically attributed to the difficulties of making ends meet as gentrification has cause prices in the city to skyrocket. He offers a list of the financial difficulties
that he and his wife face despite their middle-class status (lines 24-36), then sums up the situation with an explicit and succinct evaluation: “It SUCKS” (line 37).

From lines 42-81, he furthers this argument of Washingtonians as deserving residents by using himself as an example. These lines show a frame shift from an account of his struggles as a middle-income resident to his personal moral history of struggle and triumph over adversity. This shift from self-as-middle-class to self-as-blue-collar amounts to a justification of himself as a deserving resident, and it points to Marcos’s discomfort with the contrast between relative “ease” of the present (especially for outsiders) and the hardscrabble “old,” authentic D.C., a point I will return to at the end of this chapter. Marcos uses extensive self-reference in lines 42-81 (represented by the dramatic peak in “I” references in figure 14) to evaluate himself as an individual, and his personal life experiences, as positive examples of in-group characteristics, behavior, and values. By describing his hard work and struggle, he puts forth an argument that he is a deserving resident, and he enumerates the key values of a “real” Washingtonian through examples of his own community-oriented behavior.

Marcos’s statement that “This took a LOT” (line 44) makes it clear that, unlike the new residents, his relative comfort at the present is due to his own hard work in the past and is hence well deserved. This is expanded in the short narrative in the next lines (45-56), where Marcos describes his service in the Marine Corps. Narratives are well-documented as playing an important role in identity, including self- and other-representation, authenticity, and moral positioning (e.g., Bamberg, 2010; Ochs and Capps, 1997; Relaño-Pastor and De Fina, 2005; Schiffrin, 1996). In this mini-narrative, Marcos depicts himself as a hard worker doing dangerous “Black Ops” to earn money (lines 45-46). He next starts a series of arguments that describe D.C.
values through examples of his own choices, culminating in a moral contrast between those deserving Washingtonians who contribute to the community (as he has done), and those who are “leeching” newcomers (line 115). He begins by attributing his middle-class status to wise financial decisions (“Ages twenty-one instead of getting rims on my car and, getting a stereo system, I bought, a home”, line 47). He evaluates this behavior modestly (but positively) as not “STUPID” (line 57), a stance intensified by increased volume. He identifies this behavior as a value explicitly linked to D.C.: “You know, I- I, I- wasn't STUPID with my money, at an early age. Because of what I learned in D.C. Uh- you know I learned morals. I got my values from here, and weren't- YEAH they were somewhat hustler-ish or street-ish, WHATEVER. I just learned to take care of my FAMILY. And to take care of others” (lines 57-64). While acknowledging that some of his activities as a youth may have been shady (line 61), he maintains that they nevertheless reflected the key value of “taking care of family, of others”, which holds true regardless of the means by which it is achieved. This D.C. value of community spirit continues for Marcos today: he describes himself as taking care of his mother and his kid, and now, as a homeowner, as investing in D.C. and believing in the community. He points meaningfully to his choice to live in Petworth, a traditionally working class neighborhood, rather than in more affluent neighborhoods like the “Upper Northwest” or “off of Sixteenth Street or F, you know” (lines 70, 73): this choice represents his faith in the community, his desire to improve the neighborhood, and his intention for his son to be involved in community activities (“It's because uh- I chose Petworth and- and I didn't choose like Upper Northwest, because, I believe this is gonna get better and I BELIEVE that my kid can go down the park and be, in a soccer team” (lines 70-71). This negative evaluation of the need to live in upscale neighborhoods shows
an anti-elite position and builds contrast through repetition of negatives (lines 70-74). Marcos also shows his involvement and dedication through a brief description of his own community service painting local schools (lines 75-78)—even at institutions where he had no personal involvement. This bit of his personal history is offered as an example of the specifically Washingtonian value of involvement that Marcos has previously identified (line 64), and it is a value that non-involved newcomers and unappreciative criminals seem clearly, in his mind, to lack (lines 13, 84-87).

Marcos expands on the “we vs. they” position in terms of themes of hard work and exclusion. The Washingtonian in-group is also familiar with unrelenting hard work (“we have to work twenty-four seven”, line 106). The in-group is legitimized as wanting to contribute to the community, but limited by their need to work to make ends meet. “We want to make it better but, we have to WORK twenty-four seven, and, we don't get to enJOY it? And WE'RE Washingtonians. It DOES hurt” (lines 106-109).

Marcos’s evaluative and affective stancework negatively assesses the in-group’s difficult position, reiterating that Washingtonians’ exclusion from success “sucks” (lines 13, 37, 111, as well as my own repetition of the theme at 110) and, more personally, that it “hurts” (line 109).

As he contrasts the in- and out-groups, Marcos uses “you” as if he is addressing the outsiders directly and emphatically (“YOU’re giving it a bad image”; “YOU’re just here to leech off it”, lines 114-115). This pronominal use is more particular and emotional, forming part of a negative,
explicitly confrontational stance towards the gentrifiers. He attributes negative behavior to the out-group of gentrifiers using negative noun phrases and verbs (“giving it a bad image”; “here to leech off it”, lines 114-115). This accusatory evaluation of gentrifiers as not contributing is also intensified through emphatic stress on YOU’RE in these lines. Finally, the outgroup here is explicitly associated with some other non-D.C. place—“Vermont or wherever YOU’RE from”—to which they will inevitably return, leaving behind the “trash” and “leftovers” of their D.C. experience. Marcos frames himself as the personal agent responsible for the aftermath: “I’m stuck here with the trash. I’m here with the leftovers” (lines 118-119).

114) Like, YOU'RE giving it a bad image.
115) YOU'RE just here to kind of leech off of it and move on once you leave,
116) Amelia Uhuh.
117) Marcos and go [back to Vermont] or wherever YOU'RE from,
[syllable timing]
118) AND, [I'm] stuck here with the trash.
[monophthongal /ay/]

119) [I'm] here with the leftovers.
[monophthongal /ay/]

He continues the contrastive positioning he has already established between the groups, reinforcing their attributed actions and characteristics and evaluating these behaviors and values. At the same time, Marcos again uses himself as an example of a legitimate Washingtonian who has earned his status by suffering through the more difficult, pre-gentrification times and by working hard for himself and his community. This deservingness makes “real” Washingtonians’ current exclusion from the city’s new prosperity more poignant, as evinced through the repeated juxtaposition of examples from his personal experience with negative evaluative stances about exclusion (“It sucks”, lines 13, 37, 111). He thus further develops the argumentative sequence of
the Washingtonian in-group as deserving, in contrast to undeserving out-groups of “leeching” gentrifiers.

5.4.2 Sociophonetic features in constellation—section 1

We have seen how Marcos presents himself as example of a deserving resident who worked hard and suffered for his current residency, and as a representative of community values connected specifically to D.C. place identity. I now discuss the discursive context of low and backed /æ/ and its constellation with other non-standard features throughout this section, as well as its use when Marcos talks about his friend George, a Washingtonian business owner who gives back to the community.

Low /æ/ constellates with African American English and LE features throughout this section. In lines 50-96, Marcos uses low /æ/, monophthongal /ay/, a non-standard feature associated with African American English (Fridland, 2003), and syllable timing, a Latino English feature (Fought, 2003; Mendoza-Denton, 2008). He uses low /æ/, monophthongal /ay/, and raised volume while attributing values such as financial intelligence to D.C., and while describing “taking care of family and others” as a key D.C. value. In lines 53 and 55, Marcos uses monophthongal /ay/ when describing his initial property purchasing and selling. This coincides with lowered voice in the resolution, coda, and evaluation of his narrative (Labov, 1997)—the “so what?” moment when he makes a lot of money off of one smart decision, indicating that the use of /æ/ and /ay/ here may be a contextualization cue used for affect or dramatic effect.

This value of community involvement is continued in lines 69-70, in which Marcos uses African American English, low /æ/, and syllable timing, a Latino English feature, while self-positioning as invested in the community through his home purchase in a traditionally working-
class African American neighborhood. Phonetic variation also constellates with contextualization
cues such as raised volume and repetition (for example, in lines 55-70).

*Example 2*

46) Marcos This was, being, in the weapons platoon, doing, volunteering for, [black] ops
   **[low back /ae/]**
   just so I can get extra pay.
47) Ages twenty-one instead of getting rims on my car and, getting a stereo system, I
   BOUGHT, a home.
48) And I bought it in Germantown Maryland.
49) Because there was farmlands up there.
50) [King's] Farmland, this and that.
   [/ɪ/ raising]
51) And now there's a Mercedes dealership a SmartCar dealership or a Lamborghini
   dealership.
52) Amelia Oh (h) really?=
53) Marcos =I sold it, [I], purchased it for, one thirty-five, [I] sold it for over five hundred?
   **[monophthongal /ay/]**
   **[monophthongal /ay/]**
54) Amelia >Oh my God.<=
55) Marcos THAT'S where [I] was fortunate.=
   **[monophthongal /ay/]**
56) Amelia =>Wow<,=
57) Marcos =You know, I- I, I- wasn't STUPID with my money, at an early age.
58) Because of what I learned in D.C.
59) Uh- you know I learned morals.
60) I got my values from here, and they weren't-
61) YEAH they were, somewhat hustler-ish or street-ish,
62) WHATEVER. I just learned to take care of my >[FAMILY].<
   **[low /æ/]**
63) Amelia Mmhmm.
64) Marcos And to take care of others.
65) Amelia Mmhmm.
66) You know and, and I moved back into D.C. and I bought my mom's home, and,
   uh she lives out THERE where,
67) I had enough money to put into the condo and I sold that and,
68) met [my] wife and now I live here in Petworth and.
   **[monophthongal /ay/]**
70) It's because uh- I chose [Petworth and- and I didn't choose like Upper
   Northwest] because,
   **[syllable timing]**
71) I believe this is gonna get better and I BELIEVE that my kid can go
down the park and be, in a soccer team.
Amelia | Yeah=
Marcos | =I don't [have] to BE, off of Sixteenth Street or F, you know, up- up the street on, [low /æ/]
Marcos | You shouldn't have to do that.
Marcos | I've PAINTED Malcom- you know, uh, SEVERAL,
Amelia | [Mhmm.
Marcos | [Uh elementary schools?
Amelia | Oh cool.
Marcos | These are MARYLAND, fraternities University of Maryland, sororities that you know would come in and [I] would go with THEM. [monophthongal /ay/]
Amelia | [Mmhmm.
Marcos | Where's the community people are helping here?<
Marcos | "Well this ain't my community I'm just here for two years.”
Amelia | Mmhmm.
Marcos | There's a lot of TRANsient people.
Marcos | So they come here to, take advantage of everything that's given to them, but they don't, contribute.
Amelia | Mmhmm.
Marcos | Not everyone. But the majority do. DID that.
Amelia | But it's like their life isn't part of the community.
Marcos | They're- Yeah. "We're just here."
Amelia | Yeah.
Marcos | "Oh this place sucks" everybody complains well what have you done, to make this place better?
Marcos | There ARE your few. There ARE. There ARE that m-, have made it better.
Amelia | [my] friend George he owns uh, [Cashion's], eat and sit place. [monophthongal /ay/] [low /æ/]
Marcos | HE'S lived in D.C. his whole life too.

5.4.3 Section 1 summary

The analysis of lines 0-120 above shows how Marcos uses personal pronouns to create in- and out-groups, “We-I” references are used frequency, suggesting a focus on construction of the in-group. The excerpt starts with a discourse of exclusion, then moves to an argument about the qualities of authentic Washingtonians, who do not deserve to be excluded from the benefits of D.C.’s current prosperity. This is achieved through moral positioning of Washingtonians as
deserving and legitimate, and outsiders from other places—specifically new residents associated with gentrification—as undeserving and lacking the values of community involvement and hard work.

Marcos positions the in- and out-groups in contrastive relationship to each other, attributing different behaviors and characteristics to each group and evaluating them from his own position as legitimate Washingtonian. He thus begins to construct an identity for D.C. as a particular type of place, linked to the human activities associated with it, as well as identities for an in-group of Washingtonians and an outgroup of undeserving new residents. One of the key characteristics differentiating the groups is a strong community spirit, as shown by commitment and contribution to D.C. neighborhoods. Marcos first establishes that the new residents are not contributing to D.C., and he negatively evaluates their lack of participation. Then, using himself as an example, he illustrates the positively evaluated values and behavior he specifically attributes to D.C. In the narrative sequence in lines 44-67, Marcos develops a “bootstraps” story of his own hard work and community spirit, even if these values are reflected through unorthodox or illegal methods. D.C. values focus on community spirit and involve taking care of family and community, making smart financial decisions, working hard in blue-collar occupations, and taking risks to provide for others. This use of the self-as-example will become more fully developed into self-as-exemplar, or representative of the in-group of Washingtonians, in the following section. Marcos’s presentation of himself as a legitimate D.C. resident relates to level 2 interactional positioning in that he is positioning himself to me, the interviewer, as a deserving resident who worked his way up to his current middle-class situation from a hardscrabble background, and his story stands as an implicit contrast to those he has positioned
as undeserving outsiders. I will return to these points in the general discussion which follows in section 5.7.

Marcos used low and backed /æ/ when discussing these D.C. values, authenticating himself as an example of deserving Washingtonians with legitimate behavior. Low and backed /æ/ coincides with African American English and Latino English features while this discursive work is enacted. This suggests a potentially stylistic use of “ethnolectal” variables that may support this positioning, contributing to an authentic resident identity to which he lays a strong personal claim. This stylistic behavior suggests that indexical meanings of /æ/ may relate to broad social ideas of authenticity related to race and ethnicity, and to socio-economic status generally (Bucholtz, 2011; Cutler, 2003; Reyes, 2005). The co-occurrence of this variation with raised volume indicates that the use of these elements of Marcos’s linguistic repertoire may also serve as a kind of contextualization cue, a tendency documented in much research on style shifting and dialectal variation (Gumperz, 1983; Soukup, 2007, 2009). I will expand on this analysis in the sections that follow and in the discussion (5.7).

5.5 Section 2

121) Marcos   Um, that hurts.
122)            Why didn't they update and upgrade the Children's Museum.
123)            They just put in condos, and, [to people that make, WAY too much money.
124) Amelia     [>Yeah. That SUCKS.<
125)            That SUCKS they would have moved it from like such a, central, city location.
126) Marcos     Uhuh. Libraries, schools, I mean the schools sucked here.
127)            That's why I never went to school here.
128)            I was always, I, we would use a fake address in D.- in Maryland.
129)            I would go to Maryland schools.
130) Amelia     Mmhmm.
131) Marcos     You know I, I had to commute an hour and a half, two hours to get to school,
132) Marcos     [cause I lived in D.C.,
133) Amelia     [Mmhmm, mmhmm.
but, I wasn't gonna get educated in here. There- it was a HORRible education.

The poLICE here, THEY don't know how to treat people here from D.C.
The police force is from Iowa from, you know you got this corn-fed kid, you
know arresting people in D.C.,
there's gonna be, judgmental.
They're GONNA be, racist.
Because- it's not their fault, just [that's] how they were raised.
[back /æ/]

(hhh)

They should be, sheriffing or doing whatever in THEIR towns.
You know? You got the- that quarterback star that got hurt and he comes over
here,
He's got a chip on his shoulder.
That's why we don't like cops.
We DON'T like cops here.

Mmhmm.

You know, [that's] the [last] thing I said you know, if they, when, if,
[syllable timing] something [happened] we would, keep it in house.

We would take care of it in house.

[Mmhmm.

[We wouldn't call the police.
What good are THEY gonna do.
(h) It's just stir everything up for everybody else.
=That's it.
When stuff [happens] even in HERE, you- NOW, you'll see neighbors come out
and be like "Hey, man, what's wrong."
Because, you're concerned for your fellow [neighbor.

[Mmhmm.

You call the police, they're gonna come in and just arrest them.
[Mmhmm.

What GOOD is that gonna do. NO, none.
Uh we should have, mental health, we should have more clinics we should have
people to help OUT the community.

You know [I] would take my friends out like,
[monophthongal /ay/]

[and they would be freaked out], "[I] don't know who [I] slept with, this and
this and that" [syllable timing] [monophthongal /ay/][monophthongal /ay/]

I'd take them down to the Whitman Walker clinic.

Mmhmm.

"Let's go get you tested [man]."
Amelia Mmhmm.
Marcos Those- that's the community that I remember not just, [throwing] them away and [trilled /r/]
and, you know running away from other people.
You know those were the things that were- I miss from D.C.
And that's what we [try] to celebrate here in the area.
Like the, death with uh, um, the- when Chuck Brown died, you saw the
community [come toGETHER] you know,
>EVERYbody came together< and other people just out of curiosity, [came
together.
Amelia [Yeah.<
Marcos >EVERYbody came together< and other people just out of curiosity, [came
together.
Amelia [Yeah.
Marcos But that was the beauty of it. THAT would happen, on the DAILY.
So that- I like going to the farmer's markets, not Eastern (h) Market.
(h)
Marcos But like Union Market- Union Market?
Amelia Yeah.
That's up and coming- but NOW do you see who's coming IN the,
Outsiders.
Amelia Uuhh.
Marcos Who started Union Market.
D.C., Washingtonians.=
Amelia =Locals.
Marcos Now who's doing it. "Oh, New England Chowder." Eh? This (.)
Amelia (hhhhh)
Marcos What? Ah.
WE always joke and we want to make soul food and this and this and that,
because that's the D.C. we remember, [had, cultural food.
Amelia [Uuhh.
Marcos You know making, [empanada pupusas] but also [having] cauliflower green- and
[Mexican, Salvadoran foods] [back /ae/]
greens on the side] too.
Amelia [Uuhh.
Marcos >That's< D.C. A fusion.
Chocolate City?
We used to be Chocolate City.
Nobody knows who Chocolate City is.
THAT was D.C.
Amelia Uuhh.
Chocolate City.
It was an infusion of whatever culture you had with, the [black] culture.
[low /ae/]

[186]
In section 2, Marcos describes his life and struggles in D.C. during the days before gentrification. Following a short discussion of D.C.’s “terrible” schools at the time (lines 126-134), Marcos continues to expand and define the in-group of native Washingtonians and out-groups (police; outsiders) through juxtaposed patterns of person reference, descriptions, and attributed behavior.

This example of the privations of old D.C.—for example, bad schools and Marcos’s own difficult educational experiences—continues the theme of suffering and privation in the old days, extending the claim that Marcos, like other “real” Washingtonians, has thus earned legitimacy.
This suffering is extended to the Washingtonian in-group as schools are a community resource, and the claim of educational privation is thus extended to the community.

In section 2, person reference consists of overlapping I/we and you/they references, as the in- and out-groups are constructed in contrastive representation. As in section 1, “they” references at the beginning of section 3 specify a new “other” group, the police. This group acts as a foil or contrast for “we-group” construction in lines 135-159. Here, too, this contrast is achieved through place attributions of the corresponding out- and in-groups (specifically Iowa versus D.C.). These place identities are then expanded to include ethnocultural associations: the police are described as Iowan and “corn-fed”, implying Midwestern and white, in contrast to D.C. residents, who are implicitly non-white and explicitly urban. These identities also come with associated cultural values and behavior: for example, the police are positioned as an out-group that carries a cultural background of racism (“There’s gonna be, judgmental, They’re GONNA be racist”, lines 137-138) and is prototypically hostile to D.C. residents (“THEY don’t know how to treat people here from D.C.”, line 135).

As Marcos describes the gentrification of Union Market (lines 175-187), D.C. place identity is associated explicitly with the in-group through the term “Washingtonians”, as in section 1. He continues to contrast it with named, non-D.C. locations attributed to outsider-gentrifiers. In this case, the othered place is associated with non-local food (“New England chowder”, line 185). In contrast, D.C. is explicitly defined as “cultural” and non-white through race, food, and culture references. He thus continues to construct the white, rural, “Other” identity for gentrifiers via place references, and explicitly constructs a contrasting racial and cultural identity for D.C.
5.5.1 Positioning “us” and “them”—section 2

In section 2, Marcos expands on the “we vs. they” position through contrastive attributed values, characteristics, and behavior. This takes place in two consecutive argumentation sequences. First, Marcos characterizes D.C. police as racist outsiders, as a contrastive foil to present Washingtonians as diverse and community-minded. Next, he contrasts gentrifiers with Washingtonians and attributes different cultural and racial characteristics to each group. In both sequences, he first characterizes the two groups, then uses himself as an example of legitimate, authentic D.C. values and behavior. Marcos again explicitly associates the “we” group with this particular place: “people here from D.C.” (line 135). This we-group contrasts with the police force, who, while living “here”, are foreign in both origin and orientation (“The poLICE here, THEY don't know how to treat people here from D.C.”, line 135). This foreignness is again associated with a particular external place (Iowa), with rural whiteness (“corn-fed kid”), and with inappropriate behavior (abusing local residents and engaging in racist conduct, lines 135-138). This is attributed to dislocation—“that’s how they were raised. They should be, sheriffing or doing whatever in THEIR towns” (lines 139-140). The police used as an example of outgroup are thus positioned as incongruous outsiders who do not belong in the diverse metropolis of D.C. This group is positioned in direct opposition to the Washingtonian “we-group”, and police abuse—a byproduct of racist values associated with foreign places—is offered as an explanation for local dislike: “That's why we don't like cops. We DON'T like cops here” (lines 144-145). This negative evaluative stance is reinforced through emphatic stress and repetition, intensifying the statement’s emotional weight.

Marcos reiterates the local value of “taking care of others”, which appeared above in section 1 (line 63); here, he offers another example of neighbors (i.e., authentic Washingtonians)
taking care of each other in times of trouble: “if they, when, if, something happened we would keep it in house. We would take of it in house” (lines 147-148). Here, community spirit is specifically associated with the closely bounded in-group of a household (line 147 and it is further emphasized through repetition (line 148), and associated with a time period (the past). In this “old D.C.”, trouble was not an uncertainty but a certainty, as shown by Marcos’s correction from “if” to “when” in line 147. He makes the point that it is close personal connections, not institutional ones, that real Washingtonians depended on in those days: “We wouldn’t call the cops. What good are THEY gonna do” (lines 150-151). I support this argument through my response in line 152 (“It's just stir everything up for everybody else.”). Marcos acknowledges this response and ties this “old D.C.” value to the present through a switch to the present tense: “That’s it. When stuff happens even in HERE, you- NOW, you'll see neighbors come out and be like, Hey, man, what's wrong. Because, you're concerned for your fellow neighbor” (lines 153-154). This behavior and concern is localized in Washingtonian neighbors and neighborhoods, grounding the value of community spirit in Washington, D.C. as a place. In contrast, the out-group polices are positioned as uninvested, even damaging to the community, arresting those who call them for help (“You call the police, they're gonna come in and just arrest them,” line 157). Marcos again takes an emphatically negative stance towards this attributed behavior: “What GOOD is that gonna do. NO, none” (line 159), echoing and intensifying his earlier evaluation in line 151 (“What good are they gonna do”).

Once again, as he did in section 1, Marcos presents himself as an example of D.C. community-mindedness, describing how he would take care of other community members: “I’d take them (his friends) down to the Whitman Walker [HIV/AIDS] clinic. ‘Let’s go get you tested
man”” (lines 163-165). From this personal experience, he formulates an explicit Washingtonian value of investing in the community by taking care of each other. “Those- that's the community that I remember not just, throwing them away and and, you know running away from other people” (line 167). He explicitly locates these values and behavior in the past, and he positions them—and the community they are identified with—as lost: “You know those were the things that were- I miss from D.C. And that’s what we try to celebrate in the area. … But that [community unity, exemplified through community response to the death of iconic local musician Chuck Brown] was the beauty of it. THAT would happen, on the daily” (lines 168-174).

In lines 175-201, Marcos continues the theme of change and loss, centering his description on a concrete place reference: Union Market, an established open-air market now undergoing gentrification. He contrasts the “outsiders” who are “coming in” with “Washingtonians” (lines 178-187). In line 178, Marcos’s increased volume emphasizes the dimensions of time and invasive movement of outsiders into in-group space (“NOW”, do you see who’s coming IN the, outsiders”, lines 179-180). He contrasts this situation with the Washingtonians who originally created the market, again reinforcing the place connection with specific mention of D.C. (lines 182-183). And just as in section 1, this is contrasted with non-local newcomers, who associated with a specific place through Marcos’s reference to “New England chowder” (line 185). He contrasts this with the Washingtonian we-group and its associated “soul food… cultural food” (lines 188-191). His description of authentic Washingtonian food (“empanadas pupusas but also having cauliflower green- and greens on the side, too”, line 191) identifies these cultural markers with ethnic African American and Latino
cultures, in contrast to the white associations of “New England chowder.” For Marcos, Union Market’s current food thus serves as an indicator of the changes gentrification has wrought in his city and a reminder of the mixed African American and Latino culture he views as authentic, bygone D.C., “a fusion…Chocolate City…It was an infusion of whatever culture you had with, the black culture” (line 200).

193) Marcos  >That’s< D.C. A fusion.
194) Chocolate City?
195) We used to be Chocolate City.
196) Nobody knows who Chocolate City is.
197) THAT was D.C.
198) Amelia  Uuhh.
199) Marcos  Chocolate City.
200) It was an infusion of whatever culture you had with, the [black] culture.  [low /æ/]
201) Amelia  Mhmhm.

5.5.2 Sociophonetic features in constellation—section 2

In section 2, low or backed /æ/ occurs with the discursive construction of in-group reference and is associated with the past. Low or backed /æ/ occurs when Marcos is discussing the D.C. value, of taking care of neighbors in times of trouble, and when he uses himself as an example of this community-oriented behavior, which he extends to “we” Washingtonians in the old days (lines 147-174). Again, Marcos’s non-standard æ/ constellates with African American English and Latino English features and with expressive volume. /ɪ/ raising (“happen” to “happeen”), a feature of Latino English (Fought, 2003; Mendoza-Denton, 2008), appears in line 154, as he begins to describe community solidarity and the value of taking care of each other, giving an example of neighbors helping each other in times of trouble (line 154). As Marcos uses
himself as an example of this caring behavior, he uses monophthongal /ay/, trilled r, and low or backed /ae/ (lines 161-167).

**Example 3**

147) Marcos You know, [that's] the [last] thing I said you know, if they, when, if,
   [low /ae/] [back /ae/]
   something [happened] we would, keep it in house.
   [back /ae/]
148) Amelia We would take care of it in house.
149) Marcos [Mmhmm.
150) Marcos [We wouldn't call the police.
151) Amelia [h] It's just stir everything up for everybody else.
152) Amelia =That's it.
153) Marcos When stuff [happens] even in HERE, you- NOW, you'll see neighbors come out
   [/ɪ/ raising]
   and be like "Hey, man, what's wrong."
154) Amelia Because, you're concerned for your fellow [neighbor.
155) Amelia [Mmhmm.
156) Marcos You call the police, they're gonna come in and just arrest them.
157) Amelia [Mmhmm.
158) Marcos [What GOOD is that gonna do. NO, none.
159) Marcos Uh we should have, mental health, we should have more clinics we should have
   people to help OUT the community.
160) Amelia You know [I] would take my friends out like,
   [monophthongal /ay/
161) ]
162) [and they would be freaked out], "[I] don't know who [I] slept with, this and
   [syllable timing] [monophthongal /ay/] [monophthongal /ay/]
163) this and that"
164) Amelia I'd take them down to the Whitman Walker clinic.
165) Amelia Mmhmm.
166) Marcos "Let's go get you tested [man]."
   [back /ae/]
167) Amelia Mmhmm.
168) Marcos Those- that's the community that I remember not just, [throwing] them away and
   [trilled /r/]
   and, you know running away from other people.
The same pattern occurs to a lesser extent when Marcos conducts a more abstract metadiscussion about D.C. culture. This takes place via oppositional self- and other-positioning in terms of cultural markers (food, race) grounded in D.C.’s past. In this discussion, low or backed /æ/ occurs as Marcos describes D.C. culture in terms of food and ethnicity, conducting a meta-level discussion of “culture as culture”. In this stretch of discourse, the D.C. of the past is explicitly described as a non-white city, using the example of Latino culture blended with African American culture (lines 193-200). Code-switching to Spanish co-occurs with low and backed /æ/ in this meta-discussion of “D.C. culture as culture”, with explicit Latino food references juxtaposed with African American food.

Example 4

188) WE always joke and we want to make soul food and this and this and that,
189) because that's the D.C. we remember, [had, cultural food.
190) Amelia [Uhuh.
191) Marcos You know making, [empanada pupusas] but also [having] cauliflower green- and [Mexican, Salvadoran foods] [back /æ/]
   greens on the side[ too.
192) Amelia [Uhuh.
193) Marcos >That's< D.C. A fusion.
194) Chocolate City?
195) We used to be Chocolate City.
196) Nobody knows who Chocolate City is.
197) THAT was D.C.
198) Amelia Uhuh.
199) Marcos Chocolate City.
200) It was an infusion of whatever culture you had with, the [black] culture.
    [low /æ/]

5.5.3 Section 2 summary

In section 2, Marcos’s discursive formulations of we- and they-groups are tied explicitly to ethnicity and cultural markers, as well as to more fluid inter-group positioning. He further develops an identity for Washington, D.C. that depends on contrasts with other named locations
(Iowa, New England) that are associated with out-groups of (white) police and gentrifiers, who are out of context among Washingtonians; in contrast, Marcos casts D.C.’s own ethnic identity as a majority-minority city specifically fusing Latino and African American culture. These ethnic and cultural markers are explicitly associated with place, further connecting place with group and individual identity. Further, D.C. and Washingtonians are again associated with community and “street” values, expanding the theme of D.C. values begun in section 1. Using himself as exemplar of the group, Marcos thus reinforces the argument that Washingtonians are particular kinds of people with a set of clear moral as well as cultural dimensions: Washingtonians are deserving, ethnically diverse residents who share values of community involvement and a history of struggle; while gentrifiers are hostile, undeserving outsiders, culturally bland and lacking in values.

Finally, the group, individual, and place identities that Marcos develops through section 3 are closely associated with time. The we-group is associated with the past and the struggle for survival in old D.C., where trouble was not a possibility, but rather a certainty (shown by Marcos’s correction from “if” to “when something happened” in line 147). This echoes Marcos’s argument in section 1 that Washingtonians have earned their right to belonging through suffering through the hard times in the old days. The place identity of “real” D.C., represented by “Chocolate City”, is associated with the past (lines 195-200) and has been forgotten: “Nobody knows who Chocolate City is” (line 196). This past is also associated with a lost community and a vanished set of community values “Those were the things I miss from D.C.” (lines 168).

Throughout section 2, as Marcos does this identity work, he uses low and backed /æ/ with Latino English and African American English features when constructing the in-group.
Specifically, this occurs when Marcos discusses D.C. culture and values, and when he uses himself as an example. As with section 1, this indicates that social meanings of /ae/ relate to associations of ethnicity with an authentic in-group which, however, is strongly defined according to place. It therefore seems that, while low and backed /ae/’s meanings may relate to ethnic group associations, they more strongly index a local in-group which is attributed authenticity through minority (blended Latino and African American) race, culture, and place associations. As in section 1, these features occur with contextualization cues such as repetition and expressive volume.

5.6 Section 3

202) Marcos  You know D.C. WAS [BLACK].
               [low back /ae/]
203)        NOW, it’s, hipster.
204) Amelia  (hhhhhh) It is [hipster.
205) Marcos  [Now it’s, uh you know velour this and that and,
206) Amelia  [(hhhhh)
207) Marcos  [Huh? Hey I’m,
208)        uh I fell into it too, you saw how [I] was dressed,
               [monophthongal /ay/]
209)        I had my blazer with my plaid, crap on, [that's not me.
210) Amelia  [(hhhh)
211) Marcos  You know, I- I did that because we were going out.
212)        And you know, you gotta blend in.
213) Amelia  Yeah you gonna go to the W Hotel, [(hhh)
214) Marcos  [Yeah, going to the W Hotel,
215)        uh because- and to- and to take those luxuries, I [have] to play, like I'm one of
               [low /ae/]
               them.
216)        Just to have fun in my city?
217) Amelia  (hhhhhh)
               [low /ae/]
219) Amelia  =That's WEIRD, yeah.=
220) Marcos  =Yeah, [I] have to, imitate someone, that [I'm] not.
               [monophthongal /ay/] [monophthongal /ay/]
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221) Amelia That's true.
222) Marcos And, before, it was an honor to be who [I] was.

223) You know so, I'm [glad] I'm- I look like a mutt,
    [monophthongal /ay/]

224) you know because I'm not,

225) judged, right off the bat.

226) “OH, he's Salvadorean he's this and this and this.”

227) Amelia Mmhmm.

228) Marcos “Oh he's Mexican” this and this and this and this.

229) They're like, “I don't know what he is.”

230) Amelia (hnhh)


232) Amelia (hnhh)

233) Amelia [They can't tell?]

234) Marcos [And [I'm] a chameleon.
    [monophthongal /ay/]

235) But that's something else D.C. taught me.

236) Uh I go, but talk with New Yorkers,

237) I- I'll pick up the [accent] and I'll talk like them and their [slang].
    [low /ae/] [back /ae/]

238) In D.C. I'll pick up, our slang and [I] do what I need to do.
    [monophthongal /ay/]

239) Amelia Mmhmm.

240) Marcos And that- you know just LEARN to adapt.

241) Amelia Uhuh.

242) Marcos So, to see the people, the YOUNGER, generation, NOT adapt and their [pants]
    [low /ae/]
down to their ass,

243) it's disgusting.

244) Amelia (hnhh)

245) Marcos It's disgusting to me.

246) Because what did THEY adopt.

247) Marcos Where would- where did that [HAPPen]?
    [low /ae/]

248) And we had little CREWS and this and that but we always had respect for others.

249) Amelia Mmhmm.

250) Marcos You know and, and it was lost.

251) [That] was my thing. I love D.C. but,
    [low /ae/]

252) um, it's- there- it has its good and its bad.

253) I hate like the smoke and mirrors of illusion that it's this, this, and, luxury and this
    and that, but it's not.
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Marcos reinforces the theme of time and loss, presenting a contrast between D.C. then and now by stating: “You know D.C. WAS BLACK. NOW, it's, hipster” (line 202). He then uses his own dress and behavior the night I met him as an example of the negative effects of change on Washington, including exclusion of original residents from the new prosperity and loss of authenticity. On that night, Marcos was barhopping to celebrate his birthday, and he made a visit to the upscale W Hotel bar. He discusses the negative effects of gentrification on D.C. and its values, primarily using himself as an example of its pressures, in contrast to the they-group of gentrifiers (“I have to play, like I’m one of them … I have to imitate, someone, I’m not”, lines 215, 220). In this stretch of discourse, first-person singular references dominate, coinciding with key instances of the impersonal second-person singular “you”. As I will demonstrate below,
Marcos continues the expansion of “self-as-example” in sections 1 and 2 to “self-as-exemplar” in section 3, using the impersonal “you” to construct the abstraction.

**5.6.1 Positioning “us” and “them”—section 3**

Marcos takes a negative stance towards new, hipster D.C. by training his criticism on himself, describing his hipster clothes as “crap” (line 209). He views this new dress style as necessary in order to participate in the amenities of new, gentrified D.C. (line 215). He then negatively evaluates this need to pretend to join the out-group, expressing lack of volition (the phrase “have to”) and grudging inauthenticity (“I have to play like I’m one of them” line 215). He explicitly connects this negative situation to ownership of D.C. and the risk of his exclusion from it: “Just to have fun in my own city?” (line 216). He evaluates this situation as “pretty bad,” (line 217) and contrasts it with the more-favorable past: “Before, it was an honor to be who I was” (line 222).

By so doing, he positions himself as forced into inauthenticity in the new D.C. Impersonal use of the second-person pronoun “you” in line 212 creates a distance between himself and this inauthentic behavior, perhaps to save face, and also makes the need for camouflage extensible to the Washingtonian in-group, rather than limiting it to Marcos as an individual.

Marcos then reframes this forced positioning (Nielsen, 2012; see also Harré and Van Langenhove, 1999) as adaptability, which he casts as a positive personal characteristic and an attributed D.C. value: “And I'm a chameleon. But that's something else D.C. taught me” (lines 233-234). This introduction of adaptability as another example of D.C. values expands the list he began earlier in the interview, and it resonates with his description of D.C. values as “street”, or pragmatic/survivalist. He uses his mixed Latino heritage as an example of his ability to sidestep
racially-based social judgment (lines 223-231). He attributes his social versatility not only to ethnic composition, but also to learned behavior that he attributes directly to D.C. He thus identifies it as one of the D.C. behaviors and values gained through his experiences as a native Washingtonian: “And I'm a chameleon. But that's something else D.C. taught me” (lines 233). This value is thus projected to the in-group of native Washingtonians, rather than limited to Marcos as an individual. The impersonal use of the second-person pronoun also plays an important role in abstracting the behavioral characteristic of adaptability from Marcos to the larger Washingtonian group (“And that- you know you just LEARN to adapt”, line 240).

Marcos uses language, and his own language behavior, as an example of this “chameleon-like” adaptability: “Uh I go, but talk with New Yorkers, I- I'll pick up the accent and I'll talk like them and their slang. In D.C. I'll pick up, our slang and I do what I need to do” (lines 236-238). This “doing what needs to be done” echoes the pragmatic framing of D.C. “street” values begun in section 1. He then reiterates the learned nature of adaptability: “And that- you know you just LEARN to adapt” (line 240) and positively evaluates this value of adaptability by taking a negative stance towards its loss in the younger generation: “So to see the younger generation not adapt, it’s disgusting to me” (lines 242-245), where the negative evaluation “disgusting” is emphasized through repetition. This loss of D.C. values is explicitly stated in lines 248-250: “And we had little CREWS and this and that but we always had respect for others. You know and, and it was lost”. Marcos closes this section with two evaluative stances towards D.C. The first is positive, but qualified: “I love D.C., but it has its good and bad” (line 252). The second is a negative affective stance towards “new D.C.”: “I hate like the smoke and mirrors of illusion that it’s luxury and this and that, but it’s not” (lines 253). This allows Marcos to
simultaneously negatively evaluate new, gentrified D.C., and inauthenticity in general. In proclaiming his knowledge of a different D.C., shown through his first-hand experience and his ability to deny one type of luxurious city identity, Marcos stakes a strong second-level epistemic claim: he positions himself in the interactional world as knowledgeable and as an authentic, deserving resident. I discuss this second-level positioning in more detail in the Discussion (section 5.7) below.

5.6.2 Sociophonetic features in constellation—section 3

In section 3, low and backed /æ/ occurs when Marcos describes D.C. in the past, when he presents himself as forced into inauthenticity (lines 208-222), and when he uses himself as an example of D.C. values (lines 233-251). Marcos presents a strong contrast between D.C. then and now (“You know D.C. WAS BLACK. NOW, it's, hipster”, lines 202-203), using low, backed /æ/ and increased volume. He then presents himself as forced into inauthenticity, using low and backed /æ/ and /ay/ monophthongization in conjunction with evaluative stancework and devices such as impersonal “you” and rhetorical questions.

Example 5

207) Marcos  [Huh? Hey I'm,
208) uh I fell into it too, you saw how [I] was dressed,
[monophthongal /ay/]
209) I had my blazer with my plaid, crap on, [that's not me.
210) Amelia  [(hhhh)
211) Marcos  You know, I- I did that because we were going out.
212) Amelia  And you know, you gotta blend in.
213) Amelia  Yeah you gonna go to the W Hotel, [(hhh)
214) Marcos  [Yeah, going to the W Hotel,
215) uh because- and to- and to take those luxuries, I [have] to play, like I'm one of [low /æ/]
them.
216) Amelia  Just to have fun in my city?
217) Amelia  (hhhhhh)
[low /ae/]
219) Amelia  =That's WEIRD, yeah.=
220) Marcos  =Yeah, [I] have to, imitate someone, that [I'm] not.
[monophthongal /ay/]       [monophthongal /ay/]
221) Amelia  That's true.
222) Marcos  And, before, it was an honor to be who [I] was.
[monophthongal /ay/]

Marcos next elaborates D.C. values associated with the past (lines 223-253). While
discussing these, he uses low /ae/ and monophthongal /ay/. He discusses the value of
“chameleon”-like social adaptability in terms of his own language use and in terms of language
as a cultural marker (lines 233-240). He also discusses the loss of this value among newer
generations of Washingtonians, as a proxy for the deterioration of community values in general
as gentrification brings negative changes to D.C. and to Washingtonians (lines 247-251).

Example 6

223) You know so, I'm [glad] I'm- I look like a mutt,
[back /ae/]
224) you know because I'm not,
225) judged, right off the bat.
226) “OH, he's Salvadorean he's this and this and this.”
227) Amelia  Mmhmm.
228) Marcos  “Oh he's Mexican” this and this and this and this.
229) They're like, “I don't know what he is.”
230) Amelia  (hhhhh)
232) Amelia  (hhhh)
233) Amelia  [They can't tell?]
234) Marcos  [And [I'm] a chameleon.
[monophthongal /ay/]
235) But that's something else D.C. taught me.
236) Uh I go, but talk with New Yorkers,
237) I- I'll pick up the [accent] and I'll talk like them and their [slang].
[low /ae/]       [back /ae/]
238) In D.C. I'll pick up, our slang and [I] do what I need to do.
[monophthongal /ay/]
202
Amelia  Mmhmm.
Marcos  And that- you know you just LEARN to adapt.
Amelia  Uuhh.
Marcos  So, to see the people, the YOUNGER, generation, NOT adapt and their [pants] down to their ass,
it's disgusting.
Amelia  (hhh)
Marcos  It's disgusting to me.
Marcos  Because what did THEY adopt.
Marcos  Where would- where did that [HAPpen]? 
And we had little CREWS and this and that but we always had respect for others.
Amelia  Mmhmm.
Marcos  You know and, and it was lost.
Marcos  [That] was my thing. I love D.C. but,
low /ae/ um, it's- there- it has its good and its bad.
Marcos  I hate like the smoke and mirrors of illusion that it's this, this, and, luxury and this and that, but it's not.

5.6.3 Section 3 summary

In section 3, Marcos furthers his depiction of Washingtonians, with himself as exemplar of the group, as particular kinds of people: deserving, sharing community values, with a shared history of struggle, versus the undeserving new residents, or gentrifiers. He continues to expand and define the in-group, contrasting it with the out-group using person reference, descriptions, and attributed behavior and characteristics, and assessing each group through evaluative and affective stancework. He further develops in-group values: D.C. and Washingtonians are again associated with community and “street” values; in contrast, gentrifiers are again portrayed as negatively affecting D.C. and Washingtonians.

Marcos uses himself as an example of the negative effects of “new” D.C. on native residents. This expands his assertion in section 1 that original residents are excluded in the new D.C. He portrays the new D.C. as forcing him into inauthentic behavior. However, he then
converts this example into an illustration of positively evaluated adaptability, which he casts as a further D.C. value, and which echoes his initial framing of D.C. values as pragmatic or “street” in section 1. This value is also extended from the personal level to the in-group through use of impersonal “you”. Marcos’s broader argument is that new residents have a negative impact on the community, and that his own forced inauthenticity is actually an authentic D.C. value: the adaptability to change that first was presented as inauthentic (changing in dress to fit in) is now repositioned as an authentic cultural value of “old” D.C.

Gentrifiers are associated with the present and with unwelcome change. One negatively evaluated change associated with gentrifiers and new D.C. is personal inauthenticity, which Marcos identifies in his own behavior (“plaid crap”; “play like someone I’m not”, lines 210, 216). He describes this inauthenticity as forced (“I have to”)—it is part of the price of residency in new D.C., and it must be paid if he is to benefit from its prosperity and amenities. However, in a face-saving move, he reframes this forced personal inauthenticity as a D.C. value of versatility: “I’m a chameleon”, line 233. He positively evaluates this value and behavior through his negative evaluation of its loss among younger Washingtonians (lines 242-246). Another effect of change is inauthenticity for the city and the loss or obfuscation of its real identity. Marcos negatively evaluates this: “I hate like the smoke and mirrors that D.C. is luxury and this and that, but it’s not” (line 253). He thus portrays the real D.C. as lost, unknown to “the younger generation” (line 242), and hidden behind an inauthentic new D.C. This epistemic claim indexes his position as a legitimate Washingtonian who knows the truth about the “real” D.C., the community, and its values and behavior across time. This epistemic claim, along with the positioning of authenticity, allows him to position himself, and by extension Washingtonians, as
deserving, authentic residents associated with D.C. through cultural knowledge and long-term residence. Low and backed /æ/ occurs at key moments of discursive in-group identity construction when Marcus elaborates on D.C. values, using himself and the younger generation as examples. He uses /ay/ monophthongization in these stretches of discourse, as well as increased volume, evaluative stancework, and contextualization cues such as repetition. As I have mentioned in findings above and will discuss further in section 5.7 below, this indicates that /æ/’s social meanings relate to an interactionally-constructed Washingtonian identity positioned as authentic through place, time, positively-evaluated culture and behavior, and race-related authenticity indexed by low and backed /æ/ in conjunction with other Latino English and African American English features.

5.7 DISCUSSION

This chapter focused on Marcos’s use of low and backed /æ/ in constellation with other linguistic features in acts of discursive identity construction, particularly in interactional moments where Marcos produces linguistic constructions of an authentic, local Washingtonian identity. I first evaluated the interview interaction in terms of group and individual identity construction, using person reference and attributed characteristics. I next described how these we/they groups, constructed through personal pronominal reference, are positioned in relation to each other using attributed characteristics and behavior, and I examined Marcos’ stancework towards these groups’ respective qualities. I then showed that realizations of low, backed /æ/ align with these discourse patterns and constellates with other non-standard phonetic features documented in African American and Latino English varieties. In this section, I discuss the implications of these findings for sociophonetic identity construction along Bamberg’s (1997) 3-
level positioning model, linking micro-level discourse or, in narrative terms, “story world”
identity work (level 1) with interactional positioning (level 2) and broader social Discourses
(Gee, 1990) and ideologies (level 3).

Discourse analysis showed how Marcos created in- and out-groups using personal
pronouns and then attributed discrete characteristics to each. His pronominal productions
suggested a particular focus on constructing an in-group of Washingtonians, who are contrasted
with an out-group of outsiders, most typically gentrifiers. Ultimately, this contrastive identity
work helped him to establish a group and personal authenticity claim as part of argument that
Washingtonians are “real”, deserving residents who are wrongfully excluded from the city’s new
prosperity.

Both in- and out-groups are strongly associated with place: “here,” the deictic center, is
of course D.C., while other named locations (Vermont, Utah, New England, etc.), attributed to
the othered gentrifiers. Place and social identity are often conflated, as place references are
associated with cultural markers, values, and behaviors. D.C. is constructed as majority-minority,
with blended Latino and African American culture as represented by “cultural foods”, and with
“street values” and urban poverty. Contact and ideological affiliation between working-class
Latinos and African Americans based on commonalities of social experiences, including
discrimination, was mentioned by interviewees and also noted by Wolfram (1974) in his study of
Puerto Rican’s use of African American English features. Similarly, he constructs a racial and
cultural identity for gentrifiers through association with stereotypically white states (Utah,
Wyoming, Iowa, Vermont, New England) and descriptions of affluence, such as parental
financial support. He thus constructs an identity for D.C. as a particular type of place, linked to
the human activities associated with it, as well as identities for an in-group of Washingtonians and an out-group of undeserving foreigners, primarily gentrifying new residents. These identities are also associated with time: Washingtonians are associated with hardscrabble, pre-gentrification D.C., while gentrifiers are associated with the new, exclusive, and prosperous D.C. Deixis between past and present is thus relevant to group dynamics along lines of time, place and culture.

Washingtonian in-group construction focused heavily on less tangible cultural elements, namely, D.C. values. Community values and street smarts are framed as D.C. values, embodied in behaviors such as taking care of family and community, working hard in blue-collar occupations, taking risks to provide for others, making smart financial decisions, and being adaptable. Marcos’s enumeration of these values develops his argument that Washingtonians are residents who are legitimately linked with D.C. through social interaction and who are unjustly excluded from the city’s current prosperity. As part of group construction, Marcos used himself and his personal experiences as examples of these Washingtonian characteristics. For example, Marcos draws on his own past to illustrate D.C. values of hard work and community spirit, even if these are reflected in unorthodox or illegal methods. These small biographical narratives allow him to move between personal and abstract representation and help to establish the in-group, of which he himself is an integral and representative member.

Throughout his discourse, Marcos positioned the Washingtonian in-group and gentrifiers in contrast with each other via evaluation of the behaviors and characteristics attributed to each group. This moral positioning allows him to represent the in-group, and himself, as deserving, authentic residents who build and maintain community; in contrast, it highlights his evaluation of
the out-group as undeserving, transient, “leeching” gentrifiers whose presence affects real Washingtonians in profoundly negative ways, including the loss of their community and values and their exclusion from prosperity. Much of Marcos’s positioning revolves around the particular D.C. value of community spirit, as shown by Washingtonians’ demonstrated commitment and contribution to D.C. neighborhoods and by outsiders’ lack of participation. For example, in section 1, Marcos asserted that new residents do not contribute to D.C., an attributed behavior which he evaluates negatively. He then used his own behavior to repeatedly illustrate positively-evaluated community-oriented values that he specifically attributed to D.C.

Marcos’s use of himself as an example of hard work serves an important first-level positioning function within the discourse: it establishes him as having earned his Washingtonian status, and hence being a deserving resident: his extended residency and his suffering through difficult pre-gentrification times make him, and others like him, legitimate members of the city who have paid their dues. They deserve to be central members of a flourishing, successful D.C., and this deservingness makes the unjust exclusion of “real” Washingtonians from the city’s new prosperity more poignant. His narratives of authentic D.C. values simultaneously establish his second-level positioning in relationship to me, authenticating him in the interactional world as a real Washingtonian with a valid epistemic claim based on personal knowledge and extended experience with D.C. (Raymond & Heritage, 2006).

These first- and second-level positionings also involve third-level identity-related positioning in that both microlevel and interactional positioning draw on broader ideologies and Discourses (Gee, 1990) about authenticity, race, class, and gentrification. The relationship between ideology and identity is enacted discursively on these multiple levels, as Van Dijk
(2006) notes: “ideological discourse is generally organized by a general strategy of positive self-presentation (boasting) and negative other-presentation (derogation). This strategy may operate at all levels, generally in such a way that our good things are emphasized and our bad things de-emphasized, and the opposite for the Others—whose bad things will be enhanced, and whose good things will be mitigated, hidden or forgotten” (p. 126). Marcos specifically describes D.C. as non-white and diverse, a “Chocolate City” in which African American and Latino culture are mixed. For him, this D.C. and its native residents are associated with authenticity and with the past. In contrast, gentrifiers are racialized as white, portrayed as affluent, located as foreign, and associated with a new, inauthentic, prosperous D.C. These characterizations are relevant locally: D.C. has historically been a majority-Black city, and the loss of this majority in 2011 led to contentious debate about gentrification and the city’s identity in local and national media (coverage has ranged from The New York Times, The Washington Post, and WAMU 88.5 FM to less-formal media outlets such as the Prince of Petworth blog and curbed.com). In these characterizations, gentrification, whiteness, and affluence are related, and displacement of original, minority Washington residents is contested. These locally salient discourses relate to broader ideologies about types of people—for instance, common associations of whiteness with affluence and of brownness and working-class status with authenticity.

I now examine how sociophonetic patterning aligns with the discursive identity work described above. I first review low and backed /æ/ patterns and their relationship to discursive identity work. I then review their constellation with other Latino English and African American English features. I conclude with a discussion of the implications of these patterns.
Phonetic variation was embedded in stretches of discourse where group formation and positioning took place. Low and backed /ae/ was used while Marcos constructed in-group identity, using himself as an example and D.C. as a specific reference point. This was enacted using specific in-group attributions, such as cultural indices (for example, food, race, and social class) and values and behavior, often using stories from his personal past as illustrations. This patterning implies that /ae/ is part of Marcos’s linguistic resources for stylistic representation (Coupland, 2007).

As he describes and positively evaluates Washingtonian culture, values, and behavior—in clear contrast with his negative evaluations of the gentrifier out-group’s behavior—Marcos uses low and backed /ae/. This contrast is also explicitly associated with time (past, “old D.C.” versus present, “new D.C.”). He thus uses low and backed /ae/ while enacting important level-one positioning, juxtaposing the in- and out-groups in opposition to each other within the discourse. Taken together with his discursive preoccupation with gentrifiers and with new D.C. as inauthentic, it thus appears that Marcos uses low and backed /ae/ while constructing an identity for Washingtonians as authentic residents as part of his argumentation that they are deserving residents who are unfairly excluded from D.C.’s new prosperity. Low and backed /ae/ also constellates with other ethnolectal features of Latino English and African American English, such as trilled r, /i/ raising, syllable timing, and monophthongal /ay/ (Fought, 2003; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Thomas, 2001).

Since Marcos is himself Washingtonian, and since he uses his personal experience as an exemplar of the Washingtonian in-group’s values and attributed characteristics, this positioning using discourse and phonetic resources also allows him to position himself interactionally. In this
second-level positioning, he presents himself to me as a deserving, authentic resident. In addition, his long-term residency and first-hand knowledge of D.C. culture allow him to stake an epistemic claim to belonging (Raymond and Heritage, 2006). Since the goal in sociolinguistic interviews is to solicit and facilitate interviewee speech, I maintained a relatively passive role throughout, supporting Marcos’s talk through backchanneling and expressions of comprehension and solidarity, such as responding with laughter when he voiced outsiders, or offering support for his negative evaluations of gentrification through repetition and agreement. However, Marcos was aware that I was interested in speaking to Latino Washingtonians to learn about the Latino community and about changes in the city. This framing of the interview played a role in co-constructing the discourse and in Marcos’s self-positioning towards me as interviewer.

Third-level positioning gives insight into the broader social Discourses (Gee, 1990) or ideologies that potentially inform his variable use in identity construction and sociophonetic variation. It is possible that these stylistic features may relate to broad social ideas of authenticity relating to race and socio-economic status generally, as well as to locally-relevant discourses about gentrification. For example, Marcos’s association of non-white ethnicity, represented by Latino and African American blended culture, with old, authentic D.C., is consistent with his constellation of low and backed /æ/ with African American English and Latino English features when constructing the Washingtonian in-group and portraying them as authentic. This group is explicitly described as non-white and, given D.C.’s iconic African American history, may in some sense draw on this as part of the construction of authenticity. This resonates with other scholarship on race, ethnicity, and authenticity or the lack thereof (for example, Bucholtz (2011) on whiteness; Cutler (2003) and Reyes (2005) on blackness and authenticity) as well as with
powerful local discourses such as the debate over gentrification evinced in D.C. newspapers, radio, and local-interest websites. In this interpretation, the use of low and backed /æ/ when expressing an authentic, non-white, place-related identity may be related to, but does not seem limited to, a Latino ethnic association. This finding highlights the complexity of identity and the ways in which race and ethnicity are not static categories but can be reinterpreted. Findings are thus in line with Eckert’s (2008) argument that locally constructed meanings are key to understanding variable use; however, more research is needed to unpack the potential social meaning of /æ/ variation for Washingtonian Latinos.

In sum, evidence from sociophonetic patterning with discursive identity construction suggests that Marcos uses low and backed /æ/ stylistically in conjunction with other elements of his linguistic repertoire, including other features of Latino English and African American English, while constructing identity via positioning on multiple levels. As previous research has shown (see, e.g., Podesva, 2007), stylistic usage takes place at identity-relevant moments in interaction. In Marcos’s interview, low and backed /æ/ appears in his discourse when constructing a Washingtonian in-group in terms of culture, values, and behavior. These identity-relevant moments are also emphasized discursively through contextualization cues such as repetition and increased volume, and they relate to important issues of social justice and literal belonging and exclusion (for example, access to space and resources).

In these discursive moments, Marcos seems to be voicing an authenticity associated with place (D.C.) and time (past) through his use of low and backed /æ/ and other ethnolectal variables, with the discursive positioning of deserving, “real” residents standing in stark contrast to inauthentic gentrifiers. Marcos uses himself an exemplar in his positioning of Washingtonians
as particular kinds of people: deserving, sharing community values, with a shared history of struggle and a long-standing association with pre-gentrification D.C. In opposition to the undeserving new residents and the negative effects of their gentrification on “real” Washingtonians, Marcos develops an argument of the Washingtonian in-group as authentic residents with legitimate claims to belonging. This also takes place interactionally, where his temporal connection with D.C. and his deep knowledge of the Washingtonian culture and community, shown through descriptions, evaluations, and anecdotes of personal experience, stake an epistemic claim to belonging (Drew & Heritage, 2004). Finally, sociophonetic patterning may relate to broader ideologies as well as locally salient Discourses (Gee, 1990) of race, class, and authenticity. While more extensive research is necessary to substantiate the potential social meanings of low and backed /æ/ among Latino speakers in Washington, D.C., these findings are consistent with previous sociolinguistic research (Eckert, 1996, 2008a; Reyes, 2005) and underscore the importance of smaller studies, which allow for extensive in-depth analysis of the context of utterance to uncover potential social meanings of variation in interaction.

Finally, this analysis demonstrates the importance of integrated, fine-grained analysis to shed light on speakers’ stylistic use of repertoire (Benor, 2010) in interaction for particular expressive and interactive goals. This analysis shows that low and backed /æ/ may be used stylistically, but not as part of a simplistic ethnic association. Rather, its patterning may relate to local meanings as well as macrodiscourses about race and authenticity. This finding upholds Eckert’s (2008b) argument that ethnolectal variables are not limited to a one-to-one index of race, but extend to more nuanced, locally relevant social meanings. The use of low and backed
/ae/ for identity work within the world of discourse as well as in interactional work upholds Schilling-Estes’ (2004) finding that ethnolectal variables can be used strategically for relational as well as representational purposes when discussing topics of local importance or controversy, and further posit that this micro-level discursive work takes place within and across quantitative topic boundaries. These findings uphold the importance of integrated quantitative and qualitative methodology for research on social uses of linguistic variation (Hay & Drager, 2007; Johnstone, 2006), and indicate an important role for micro-level discourse analysis and qualitative approaches to style in conjunction with quantitative analysis of style shifting. They further suggest that stance and positioning offer a more fine-grained explanation for stylistic variation findings than quantitative topic-related shifting. This explanation is grounded in the discourse context on multiple levels and helps demonstrate potential social meanings attached to low and backed /ae/ as related to speakers’ individual experiences, interactional goals, and relationship to broader social patterns and constructs.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This chapter will review and summarize the dissertation research, methods, findings, and implications for sociolinguistic and sociophonetic research on phonological production and identity construction. I will begin by reviewing the dissertation’s research questions, aims, and methodology. I then provide an overview of findings and discussion of contributions. I conclude with a discussion of the project’s broader applications and limitations, and I outline some possible directions for future research.

This study aimed to investigate /æ/ realization and variation among first- and second-generation Latino immigrants in Washington, D.C., an understudied minority community undergoing change related to gentrification. This project has implications for understanding the relationship between language, society and identity construction in contexts of migration. It addresses two questions related to the production and social meaning of the phonological feature /æ/, which was selected due to its contrastive realizations in Chicano English and general American English, and its potential as a sociolinguistic and stylistic variable in Chicano English (Carter, 2007; Eckert, 1996, 2008a; Thomas, 2001, 2014; Roeder, 2006, 2009; among others):

1) *How does /æ/, a phonological feature showing a well-documented distinction between Chicano English and general American English varieties, vary in the English of Washington, D.C. Latinos?*

2) *How does /æ/ variation contribute to stylistic variation and interactional construction of identity in sociolinguistic interviews and other interactional contexts?*
I used quantitative and qualitative analysis to address these questions, examining /ae/’s variable realization, linguistic and social conditioning, stylistic use, and potential social associations in sociolinguistic interviews and self-recorded data from bilingual first and second-generation Washingtonian Latinos. This close examination gives insight into the identity work which the variable can perform. I used inter-speaker and intra-speaker variation analysis to examine the effect of independent social and linguistic factors on /ae/ realization (preceding/following linguistic environment; gender; immigration generation; education level; discourse topic; interaction type) via mixed-model regression modelling. These factors aimed to address classic sociolinguistic factors as well as language proficiency and identity-related style shifting. I supplemented these quantitative findings with qualitative discourse analysis that examined identity construction through the lens of self- and other-positioning (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Du Bois, 2007; Goffman, 1981; Schiffrin, 2002) and examined constellations of low and backed /ae/ with other ethnolectal features in one speaker’s discursive identity construction. Speaker metadiscourse was also used to contextualize /ae/ variation.

Findings indicate that /ae/ variation may be associated with ethnocultural practices, its use does not necessarily directly signal ethnic identity, and that /ae/ variation may hold different, related meanings for different people or in particular interactional contexts. This resonates with Eckert’s (2008b) contention that sociolinguistic variables can hold a range of related meanings and indicates that ethnolectal /ae/ variation may be acquiring meaning for Washingtonian Latinos. I will discuss findings and implications in more detail in the sections that follow.
6.1 Contributions

This dissertation makes contributions to the important but relatively understudied research area of Latino Englishes. Its diversity of participants enables a comparison between Latinos of diverse backgrounds, who can together be compared with Chicano English, the primary variety of Latino English for which /ae/ data are available. The study offers a perspective on the relationships between group patterns and individual language practices, between systemic language variation and system evolution. It takes a needed step toward documenting Latino language practices and potentially emergent new dialect features; more specifically, it contributes to an understanding of Spanish substrate contributions to Latino English /ae/ variation, and it points to the social factors that may affect the maintenance of transfer-related phonological features in variety coalescence. It adds to growing research on style, repertoire, and identity, emphasizing the connections between interaction and identity (Rickford, 1985), and underscoring the role of language practice as a nexus of identity work potentially influencing language change (Eckert, 1990). It demonstrates the value of mixed methods in sociolinguistic and sociophonetic research, where discourse analysis can provide important insights into the relationship between linguistic features and social meanings. This dissertation also has implications for language and identity in minority and immigrant communities, and it contributes to research on place identity and the relationships between language, place, and space (Auer, 2013; Johnstone, 1990, 2004, 2010a).

6.2 Summary of Findings

Quantitative findings showed /ae/ to vary along linguistic and social dimensions for speakers as a group as well as for individuals. Preceding and following linguistic environment
significantly affected /æ/ raising and fronting, and lowering and backing (p<0.05). Following phonetic environment had the strongest effect, with conditioning effects by place and manner of articulation generally consistent with previous research on general American and Chicano English (Eckert, 1996, 2008a; Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Jones, 2003; Labov, 1994; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2006, 2009; Thomas, 2001). These patterns indicate that speakers are following American English phonotactic rules. The majority of speakers showed a weaker nasal-raising pattern that is more consistent with Chicano English than with general American English. Speakers’ adherence to American English phonotactic rules indicates that their low, backed /æ/ is a systemic feature of a native English system, not non-native English. This interpretation is supported by speakers’ phonemic distinction between /æ/ and /ɛ/, which is one key means of distinguishing between Latino English varieties and non-native English (Fought, 2003).

City or suburb residence significantly affected F1 for speakers as a whole, with suburban residence conditioning lower /æ/ realization than D.C. proper (p<0.05). This pattern corresponds to gentrification-related residency changes in D.C. that have shifted many of the speakers who would be most likely to develop ethnolectal language features – i.e., working-class immigrants with primarily ethnic-group social networks and strong ethnic orientations – to the suburbs. Urban residents reported more diverse social networks, which are typically associated with broader linguistic repertoires (Sharma, 2011).

Lack of significant variation in /æ/ lowering and backing or raising and fronting by immigrant generation indicates that the feature may be being conserved among second-generation speakers. Given the linguistic similarities between first-generation (1.5) and second-
generation speakers, however, this interpretation should not be taken as conclusive. Lack of significant findings for country of origin indicates that /ae/ variation is a common feature across immigrant groups, implying that it may be due to Spanish substrate transfer. Insignificance of age as a predicting factor may be due to the fact that the D.C. Latino community reflects continuous immigration, so that linguistic background and social experiences do not necessarily correlate with age groupings. Similarly, the lack of a statistically significant gender pattern may relate to diversity in individuals’ social experiences and orientations. Since gendered behavior often relates to social networks and informs orientation to locally salient social referent groups, however, gendered language practices could provide a fruitful avenue for further study (Eckert, 1990, 1996; Milroy & Milroy, 1978; Sharma, 2011). While the small sample size used in this dissertation prevents generalization, these findings present intriguing directions for future, larger-scale study.

Individual differences indicated that social contact, access to different varieties, and identity, as discussed by participants and expressed through their metalinguistic commentary, influenced speakers’ language behavior (Carter, 2007; Gordon, 2000; Rickford, 1985; Santa Ana, 1993). These individual differences related to speakers’ personal experiences, daily-life events and interactions (for example, educational institutions; friendship groups; experiences with racism). While social class and education were not found to be significant predictors in this study, individual differences within the residency pattern do suggest relationships between social networks, social class, and educational environment (as previous research has repeatedly shown; e.g., Rickford, 1986; Eckert, 1996). Level of education per se had no statistically-significant impact on /ae/ variation, but an educational pattern was observed in a comparison of speakers’
averages for pre-nasal and non-nasal /ae/: speakers who had attended elite universities had /ae/ patterns similar to European Americans. These speakers were from affluent, educated backgrounds and were considered “Americanized” or not typically Latino by themselves and others. Working-class speakers who had attended elite secondary institutions and who also generally expressed strong identification with Latino identity showed a range of “ethnolectal” and general (white) American patterns, indicating that their educational experiences may have expanded their linguistic repertoires and potentially their associations with different realizations. This resonates with previous research showing that higher degrees of education, affluence, and assimilation reduce the use of vernacular features (Prichard & Tamminga, 2012; Santa Ana, 1993), and indicates that contact-induced linguistic features may be mediated by external factors that arise in the sociocultural environment. These connections suggest that further research on this vein might productively address the relationship between social class, type of educational institution (for example, public versus private), and stylistic repertoire.

The variation of /ae/ appears to be sensitive to social ideologies of race and ethnicity as experienced by speakers in the sociocultural environment. Orientation to Latino identity played a role in /ae/ patterning for speakers who had access to general American English through education, as described above, and Latino English practices were often associated with ethnic identity through metalinguistic commentary.

Intra-speaker analysis showed significant stylistic /ae/ variation (p<0.05) by topic and interactional setting in two speakers, Marcos and Candida, indicating that F1 and F2 variation are available for identity work related to discourse topics (F1, Marcos) and interactional context (F1/F2, Candida). Marcos’s /ae/ realizations were significantly likely to be low when discussing
changes in D.C. and gentrification. Candida’s /ae/ realization was significantly likely to be raised and backed in her workplace interaction and significantly likely to be low in her conversation with a friend at the park. These findings indicate that low /ae/ may carry associations relevant to identity work about change and gentrification in D.C., and that lowered or raised /ae/, or backed /ae/, may be used agentively in particular interactional settings due to associations of register-appropriateness, such as casualness with a friend or formality at work, and to create interlocutor distance or intimacy.

In order to explore these possible associations, the quantitative analysis I have just described was complemented by detailed discourse analysis, which demonstrated more nuanced and complex identity work and highlighted potential social meanings of low and backed /ae/. A discourse-analytic case study of Marcos’s speech was used to investigate the social meanings of his stylistic /ae/ usage. In his interview, Marcos used lowest and most backed /ae/ realizations when performing identity work involving discursive self- and other-positioning on multiple levels (Bamberg, 1997). These tokens clustered in stretches of discourse across topics; in other words, token clusters occurred within the statistically-significant “changes in D.C.” topic, but also occurred in identity-relevant places across quantitative boundaries. By enabling the examination of identity work within and beyond the boundaries of quantitative style-shifting, discourse analysis made important contributions to sociophonetic analysis. Phonetic variation was embedded in stretches of discourse where group identification and positioning took place. Low and backed /ae/ was used in stretches of discourse where Marcos constructed an in-group identity, using himself as an example and D.C. as a specific reference point. He repeatedly used stancework (specifically through attributed values, behavior, and cultural indices related to race
and ethnicity, such as food and social class) to create a contrast between a positively evaluated Washingtonian in-group and a negatively evaluated out-group of gentrifiers. This contrast is also explicitly associated with time (past, “old D.C.” versus present, “new D.C.”). These low and backed /æ/ tokens co-occur with other ethnolectal features of Latino English and African American English, such as trilled r, /ı/ raising, syllable timing, and monophthongal /ay/ (Fought, 2003; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Thomas, 2001). The constellation of ethnolectal features at key moments in the interview when Marcos constructs identity through positioning towards gentrification suggests that /æ/ variation is socially meaningful.

Positioning took place on multiple levels (Bamberg, 1997). At the discursive level (first-level positioning), Marcos developed an argument about the Washingtonian in-group as authentic residents with legitimate claims to belonging. To do this, he used descriptions and attributions to construct a sharp contrast between deserving, “real” residents and undeserving, inauthentic gentrifiers. This focused on local cultural values of community participation, street smarts, and adaptability, as well as broader, more overt cultural indices of class, race, and ethnicity. Marcos used himself and his personal experiences as examples of these Washingtonian characteristics, establishing the in-group with himself as an integral and representative member, and positioning himself interactionally (second-level positioning) to me as an authentic Washingtonian with a legitimate claim to belonging based on his cultural knowledge, extended residency in the city, and his endurance through the hard times of pre-gentrification D.C. By interactionally positioning himself as having first-hand knowledge about Washingtonian identity, he puts forward a strong epistemic claim (Raymond & Heritage, 2006) in support of his argument. Marcos’s discursive positioning with respect to ideologies about race and class (third-
level positioning) shows that these social categories are relevant to his world view and his conceptualization of social identity, and thus inform his discursive and sociophonetic acts of identity (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985).

6.3 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The implications of these results must be addressed. The first research question asked, *how does /ae/, a phonological feature showing a well-documented distinction between Chicano English, the most-studied Latino English dialect, and general American English varieties, vary in the English of Washington, D.C. Latinos?* I find that /ae/ varies by linguistic environment in accordance with native English conditioning and shows the weaker Chicano English nasal-raising pattern, indicating that /ae/ variation is a native (rather than learner) English feature, as in previous research on Chicano English (Eckert, 1996; Gordon, 2001). It also varies according to social factors within speakers as a group and in individuals, suggesting that /ae/ is sensitive to individuals’ social contexts such as social networks, education, and linguistic exposure, which relate to patterns of geographic/demographic residence, and to social processes related to migration (e.g., language shift, adaptation, assimilation). The variability of /ae/ also performed an important role in identity expression. Low and backed /ae/ was found to be stylistically significant in association with topic and interactional context. Speakers’ metalinguistic commentary indicated that ethnic identity is potentially related to use of low and backed, “ethnolectal” /ae/ realizations. Qualitative analysis of the positioning and stancework surrounding one speaker’s use of that feature, along with clusters of other sociophonetic features, suggest that low and backed /ae/ could be available for strategic use for identity purposes, and
that its social meaning may relate to local meanings linked but not limited to ethnicity, such as

The similarity between /ae/ in this study and in Chicano English indicates that analogous
linguistic transfer processes as those which originally contributed to low, backed Chicano
English /ae/ may be at work in various Latino Englishes, leading to the eventual incorporation of
substrate-origin non-standard /æ/ into native English systems. The weaker nasal-raising pattern
and lower, backed /æ/ may relate to substrate influence, since Spanish lacks an analogous low,
front vowel to that of American English. The commonality of Spanish as a substrate language
may therefore produce similar phonological effects on the native English speech varieties that
have emerged in diverse Latino communities. This interpretation is supported by the lack of
significant findings by country of origin, suggesting a possible common linguistic origin from
the shared Spanish substrate across immigrant groups.

Lack of significant /ae/ variation by immigrant generation suggests that low, backed /æ/
is being conserved across speaker generations, although this finding should be taken as
preliminary. This supports the theory that the Latino English /æ/ pattern may have its origin in
Spanish phonological transfer but be conserved as part of the dialectal system of subsequent
speaker generations, a suggestion supported by Marcos’s less-raised Latino English pattern,
since his first productive language was English. The possibility of the relationship between
speakers’ non-standard /æ/ realization and substrate Spanish influence is intriguing, particularly
in light of Labov’s (2008) observation that “studies often have difficulty in tracing ethnically
marked differences in linguistic behavior directly to the substrate language” (pp. 217-218; as
The second research question for this study asked, how does /ae/ variation contribute to stylistic variation and interactional construction of identity in sociolinguistic interviews and other interactional contexts? Significant differences in /ae/ realization by topic and interactional context indicated that /ae/ is stylistically active, with ethnolectal lowered and backed realizations potentially having social meanings that are used for personal identity construction and may relate to ethnicity and associated values such as authenticity (Marcos), or to register associations such as formality, or interactional intimacy and distance (Candida). Use of a subset of extremely lowered or backed /ae/ tokens in key moments of discursive identity construction suggested that the variable may be related to ethnicity and local identity. Speaker metacommentary further indicated social associations with Latino and general (white) American English language practices.

In his interview, Marcos used a significantly lower /ae/ realization when discussing changes in D.C., including gentrification, and a higher realization when discussing non-D.C. related topics. Given much previous research on the association of different non-standard dialects and bilingual practices with social in-groups (e.g., Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982), Marcos’ pattern may relate to associations of the low ethnolectal realization with Latino or local identity (Eckert, 1996, 2008a), particularly since gentrification in Washington, D.C. is racially controversial and associated with the displacement of black and minority residents by white newcomers. This controversy foregrounds potential social meanings attached to /ae/, since situations of social contact and conflict tend to highlight stylistic language practices as part of identity construction (Eckert, 2011). As previously discussed, European American Washingtonian /ae/ was higher and more fronted than that of Latino Washingtonians. However,
more research is necessary on English in general in Washington, D.C., and in particular on African American /æ/, which has shown variation between being higher and lower than European American patterns in cities in the Midwest and Southeast (Deser, 1989; Kohn & Farrington, 2013; Labov, 2014). Candida’s significant use of low /æ/ in casual conversation with a friend, and /æ/ raising and backing when at her job, may relate to well-documented language attitudes that stigmatize ethnolectal and “vernacular” features, or limit their use to casual and intimate contexts, and equate more “standard” realizations with linguistic correctness, associating them with more formal or more self-conscious contexts (Alim & Smitherman, 2012; Labov, 2001b; Lippi-Green, 2011; Purnell, Idsardi, & Baugh, 1999; Rickford, 1999). Style shifting patterns for Marcos and Candida showed that F1 and F2 did not always move in synchronicity (i.e., forward and front, or lower and back). This finding indicates that F1 and F2 may operate independently in regard to socially conditioned variation, an observation also made by Eckert (1996) and Fought (2003) in their studies of Chicano English in California. It further implies that F1 and F2 may be able to acquire social meanings independently; however, further research will be necessary to explore this area.

Speaker metacommentary as a whole revealed social meanings attached to Latino and general (white) English. Metacommentary revealed that general American English is associated with education and “whiteness” (Bucholtz, 2011) both practically and ideologically; some speakers who attended elite high schools commented that they were “all white kids”, and this was associated with “correct”, “non-ethnic” speech. Latino language practices were associated with ethnic identity, as Hector indicated when he commented that he “sounds Latino” in English (see section 4.1.6). This finding resonates with previous research on low, backed /æ/ as a
stylistic variable in Chicano English that contrasts with general or majority-group varieties associated with whiteness (Eckert, 2008a), although speakers in my study and in previous research did not comment specifically on /ae/ (Eckert, 1996, 2008a), indicating that this particular feature has not yet reached the stereotype stage (Labov, 1972a).

Qualitative analysis of Marcos’s use of /ae/ in discourse showed that the variable’s social meanings are locally constructed in interaction, as well as potentially related to broader ideologies of race, place, and authenticity (Bucholtz, 2011; Cutler, 1997, 2003; Reyes, 2005). Sociophonetic examination showed that Marcos used a subset of extremely low and backed /ae/ tokens stylistically in conjunction with other elements of his linguistic repertoire, including other features of Latino English and African American English, while constructing identity via self- and other-positioning at multiple levels of discourse (Bamberg, 1997). As in previous research (Podesva, 2007), stylistic clusters occurred at identity-relevant moments in the interaction: when Marcos was discursively constructing a Washingtonian in-group based on shared culture, values, and behavior. In-group construction in opposition to an out-group of negatively-evaluated gentrifiers is part of a broader argument about Washingtonian legitimacy, ownership, and belonging that relates to important issues of social justice (for example, access to space and resources). At the same time, it is part of Marcos’s own interactional positioning as a “real Washingtonian” toward me, his interviewer and interlocutor. In these identity-relevant interactional moments, low and backed /ae/ constellated with other ethnolectal features of Latino English and African American English, such as trilled r, /ɪ/-raising, syllable timing, and monophthongal /ay/ (Fought, 2003; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Thomas, 2001). These identity-
relevant moments were also emphasized discursively through contextualization cues such as repetition and increased volume.

This identity work was relevant on multiple, simultaneous levels of positioning (Bamberg, 1997). Through oppositional positioning at the discourse level (first-level positioning), Marcos developed an argument for a Washingtonian moral claim to D.C. and established his own Washingtonian status by using himself as an example. This argument simultaneously positioned him to me interactionally (second-level positioning) as a deserving resident with a claim to legitimacy based on behavioral norms and epistemic and temporal claims: first-hand knowledge of change in D.C., and long-term residency. And at the ideological level (third-level positioning), Marcos’s discussion of race, social class, and gentrification shows that these social categories and concerns are relevant to his understanding of personal and group identity. These findings suggest that /ae/ may have social meaning related to race and ethnicity as proxies for culture and behavior, which in turn are used in connection with place, identity, and a claim to belonging.

The combination of qualitative evidence of Marcos’s own identity construction and salient ideologies and the patterning of his low and backed /ae/ with other ethnolectal repertoire features together indicate that the variable’s social meanings may relate to ethnicity and related ideologies about social characteristics and place associations. Marcos specifically conceives of D.C. and Washingtonians in terms of minority-race status and racializes outsiders and gentrifiers as white through associations with New England and the Midwest in particular. Marcos’s association of old, authentic D.C. with non-white ethnicity, as represented by Latino and African
American blended culture, is consistent with his use of low and backed /æ/ together with AAE and LE features when constructing and portraying an authentic Washingtonian identity.

These characterizations are relevant locally: D.C. has historically had an African American majority, and the loss of this majority in 2011 led to contentious debate in local and national media about gentrification and the city’s identity. In these public discourses, gentrification, whiteness, and affluence are related, and displacement of original, minority Washington residents is contested. Previous sociolinguistic research on ethnolectal features and social meaning shows that minority, particularly African American, language practices are associated with authenticity and whiteness with inauthenticity (for example, Bucholtz, 2011; Cutler, 2003; Reyes, 2005). These social meanings resonate with the D.C. context, where racial and ethnic aspects of identity are highlighted through gentrification and widespread displacement of minority residents. Locally salient discourses therefore relate to broader ideologies about types of people, for instance general associations of whiteness with affluence and of brownness and working-class status with authenticity.

While /æ/ variation may be associated with ethnocultural practices, its use does not necessarily directly signal ethnic identity. For example, Marcos’s stylistic /æ/ usage appears to index a local authenticity related to race and non-whiteness, rather than Latino identity per se. Candida’s /æ/-shifting may be better explained by language attitudes of (in)correctness that attach to vernaculars and ethnolects than by any particular ethnic identity display. Marcos’s and Candida’s style shifting indicate that the same variable may hold different, related meanings for different people or in different interactional contexts. This resonates with Eckert’s (2008b) theory of indexical fields, or a range of related meanings associated with sociolinguistic
variables, and indicates that ethnolectal /ae/ variation may be acquiring a field of indexical meanings in the D.C. Latino context.

In conjunction with Latino English features, Marcos appears to be strategically using African American English features such as monophthongal /ay/, a part of his linguistic repertoire acquired through social contact with Black Washingtonians in childhood, as part of a legitimacy strategy that rests on an authentic local identity associated with his own experiences and the historical D.C. community. Place and social identity are intimately linked: D.C. place identity is racialized as non-white, specifically as a blending of (in this case) Latino and African American culture. In this, African American D.C. appears to be a salient reference point, but a distinct local Latino identity can also be discerned. Social categories of race are themselves seen to be flexible and related to local meanings. In an interesting counterpoint to previous research on Latino affiliation with African Americans and use of African American English (Bailey, 2001b; Wolfram, 1974), Marcos is not Afro-Latino and does not identify as such. However, Wolfram (1974) notes a commonality of social discrimination between Latinos and African Americans, as well as social contact between them in marginalized urban areas: “There is a commonality between the two groups in that they are set apart by lines of demarcation: the blacks by a color line and the Puerto Ricans by an ethnic line that is equally real” (p. 22). This similarity of experiences and expressed affinity with African Americans, with its potential for cultural and linguistic contact, was echoed by other participants. For example, Noemi, a pilot-study participant, commented “Yeah it’s something like that kind of combining things because blacks and Latinos kind of roll in, the same kind of circles um, same kind of places”; and Emanuel commented, “Kids nowadays, you know like Latino kids, they sound like they’re black kids”.
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The importance of this commonality of experience is highlighted since participants, and much of the D.C. Latino population, are not of visible African ancestry, do not identify as black, and are not identified by others as such. Finally, it should be noted that these themes coexisted within a more complex social dynamic: participants reported social contact and affiliation, but also conflict and tension, between Latinos and African Americans, an observation also noted by Wolfram (1974).

Findings highlight the primacy of interaction in sociolinguistics and style and the complexity of social factors extending far beyond identity category labels. The study thus further underscores the importance of taking into account individuals’ experiences and local sociocultural and sociohistorical contexts and changes. This emphasizes the importance of multiple methodological approaches to variation and style, and the need for understanding social context through ethnography, speaker metacommentary, and discourse analysis.

Sociophonetic patterning showed that extremely low and backed /æ/ tokens and other non-standard features of Marcos’ linguistic repertoire occurred in identity-salient stretches of discourse (Podesva, 2007) within and across quantitative topic boundaries. This research suggests that identity construction using stance and positioning may offer a more adequate explanation for the social meaning of stylistic variation than quantitative methods alone. Like much recent work in style and identity, the study further demonstrates the utility of integrated quantitative and qualitative methodology to address variation in context. Its findings uphold the importance of discourse analytic contributions to sociolinguistic and sociophonetic research (Hay & Drager, 2007; Johnstone, 2006), productively extending Bamberg’s (1997) three-level positioning model to non-narrative discourse. By grounding the interpretation of a variant’s
social meaning in interactional contexts across multiple levels of meaning, the study demonstrates how the integration of discourse analysis with variation analysis can offer important insight into the processes by which meaning attaches to sociolinguistic variants.

The findings highlight the important contributions that smaller, highly detailed studies can make to our understanding of language, identity, and the social motivations for variation (Schilling-Estes, 2004), with implications for future research on varietal coalescence and identity construction. An important implication of these findings is that fine-grained, smaller-scale projects can add valuable insight into the complexity of social factors affecting individuals, enriching our understanding of larger group patterns and providing a basis of comparison with existing research as well as future research directions. Fine-grained sociophonetic analysis is particularly relevant to understanding speakers’ stylistic use of repertoire (Benor, 2010) for identity construction and relational work in interaction. This research also highlights the need for data from a range of interactional contexts to substantiate claims about identity practices and social meaning, particularly in multilingual communities (Sharma, 2011).

The study also offers a productive complement to other research on Latino Englishes and Latino language practices, with implications for ethnic-group language development in early immigrant generations. Indeed, its findings may be relevant to other ethnic groups, contexts, and ethnolects as American immigration patterns change and suburbs become increasingly diverse (Frey, 2015).

6.4 LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The results of this dissertation suggest a number of important directions for future research. More research is clearly needed to expand the documentation of features, investigate
potential varietal coalescence, expand the role of social context in feature acquisition and maintenance, expand stylistic analysis, and substantiate the social meanings of /ae/ variation in the speech of D.C.-area Latinos.

The study points to some evidence of Spanish substrate influence in a native English variety, and of maintenance of the non-standard feature. This provides insight into the different social and linguistic factors that may influence the maintenance or loss of transfer-associated phonology over time, and hence affect feature incorporation into potentially emergent dialect systems. However, given linguistic similarities between the first-generation (1.5) and second-generation speakers in my sample, this finding must be substantiated by research on third-generation immigrants and English-monolingual Latinos. Future research with an expanded speaker sample would help provide a more complete view of Latino language behaviors in Washington, D.C. Research on multiple phonological variables and other structural features is also needed to explore the possibility of emergent Latino English varieties and repertoires in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. A comparison with African American English /ae/ in Washington, D.C. would be of great interest, as would comparison of other phonological features in African American and European American English in D.C. For example, in LCDC research, Lee (forthcoming) identified variation in /o/-fronting by social group, with African Americans fronting less than European Americans, and Grieser (2013, 2014) noted stylistic use of t-release in African American Washingtonians discussing gentrification. An expansion of research on Latino English and expanded comparison with data on other Washingtonian social groups would thus be of interest to sociolinguistic research on Washington, D.C. and research on language and social contact more broadly.
Larger-scale research on /ae/ variation could illuminate broader inter-speaker social patterns and could potentially reveal other significant factors that could not be discerned in this study’s smaller sample. Expanded research on suburb versus city residents would be useful to support the residency pattern and substantiate its cause. Given the importance of interaction indicated by qualitative findings in this dissertation, principled analysis of social networks might be a productive methodological direction for expanded research sites. These networks might relate to broader settlement patterns by Latino immigrant groups of different nationalities, producing productive insights into shared substrate patterns or differences in mediating social factors. One area of interest would be Prince George’s County, Maryland. The Brookings Institute (2010) notes that D.C.’s suburban demographics are changing, with white residents declining and Latino and Asian populations increasing since 2000. However, Prince George’s County maintains its African American majority. Given Wolfram’s (1974) observation that Puerto Rican language and cultural assimilation related to suburb or city residence in accordance with older demographic patterns, with an urban, working-class African American population and upwardly-mobile, suburban white population, Prince George’s County offers an interesting site for possible comparative research on Washingtonian Latinos. A comparison with other minority diaspora communities and neighborhoods experiencing immigration and gentrification-related displacement would also be of interest, both within the D.C. metropolitan area (for example, its large Korean and Ethiopian communities; Migration Policy Institute, 2014; Zong & Batalova, 2014) and beyond.

More research is also indicated on stylistic variation. Individual stylistic work has revealed speech practices which may influence broader group language behavior over time.
(Eckert, 2000). Principled discourse analysis of Candida’s interview and self-recordings could provide a useful comparison with Marcos’s findings and contribute to a deeper understanding of /ae/’s potential social meanings in a D.C. Latino context. Further research on style shifting across a larger number of speakers is of interest to see whether stylistic usage of /ae/ is more widely present, whether common topics or interactional settings emerge as significant, and whether common variation patterns (for example, correlation between low, backed /ae/ and particular topics or particular interactional settings) are observed. This research could give insight into potential indexical fields (Eckert, 2008b) of social meanings related to /ae/ in the Washington, D.C. Latino context. Future research on raised and fronted /ae/ in individuals, such as Marcos, and the larger group, would productively complement the analysis of low and backed /ae/. A closer look at constellations of multiple variables is also needed in order to provide a more comprehensive view of speakers’ repertoires. This could also provide insight into language, identity, and contact between minority groups (Carter, 2013; Wolfram 1974), as for example with stylistic constellation of African American English and Latino English features.

Research on these themes will also benefit from more extensive self-recorded data. Field recording conditions meant that several recordings in this study were compromised by background noise and could not be used for reliable analysis. In future, I would ask that self-recorders record more widely in order to maximize the amount of usable data. More extensive self-recorded data would also support a more thorough understanding of speakers’ multilingual repertoires, providing a fuller picture of speakers’ English and Spanish practices in different social settings. While the scope of this dissertation precluded discourse analysis of speakers’ self-recorded data, this type of detailed qualitative analysis would be an essential component in a
more detailed study of the style shifting behavior observed in different interactive contexts. Principled discourse analysis would be a key source of insight into speakers’ identity work, attitudes, and ideologies. In-depth analysis of discourse moves and variant patterning within this data would therefore expand our understanding of the different potential social meanings attached to /ae/ variants in D.C.-area Latinos’ English language practices.

Future research would also benefit from more structured collection of information on speakers’ social networks and language backgrounds. In this dissertation, I relied on participant self-reports of language use and ability, which offered the joint advantages of brevity and of not making participants self-conscious. However, more structured language tasks to determine language proficiency and more-comprehensive documentation of social networks (e.g., language use maps and social network webs) could add insight into linguistic findings and expand our understanding of the meanings of stylistic variation.

Findings indicated that speakers made stylistic use of /ae/ variation along the F1 and F2 dimensions. This indicates that variation along these dimensions is socially meaningful, consistent with previous research (Krauss & Pardo, 2006, p. 12). Findings further indicated that F1 and F2 may operate separately in terms of style and, potentially, social meaning, an intriguing possibility also noted by Eckert (2001) and Fought (2003). Future research is indicated to explore this and discover what social meaning might potentially link with different F1 and F2 realizations. One productive direction for exploration might be a perception study addressing whether /ae/ variation is perceptible to listeners along the F1 and F2 dimensions independently or together, and what social meanings listeners may attach to different realizations of the variable.
This sort of study could provide a complementary counterpoint to the production-oriented results of this dissertation.

Finally, this study highlights the need for more research on Latino Englishes and other ethnolects associated with patterns of migration, particularly because they offer a view into the social and linguistic processes that may be at work in contact-origin language variation, and the relationship between language and group and individual identity. Comparative studies on other Latino communities and other immigrant populations can expand our understanding of the relationship between language elements and systemic structural development, social practices, and identity (Fought, 2006). By revealing similarities and differences in attitudes towards language and identity, and by examining their potential influence on linguistic practices, research in this area can also shed light on the linguistic impact of resistance to or assimilation of hegemonic social ideologies.

Much work is still needed to increase understanding and reduce the stigma associated with non-standard and ethnic-associated English varieties, and the social consequences of such a campaign would be far-reaching. Research on minority and immigrant populations can give a view into how non-standard linguistic forms emerge as elements of legitimate language systems that relate to social contact, ethnic affiliation and cultural pride. Rather than being stigmatized as incorrect or poorly acquired English, these non-standard features may be appreciated as resources for skillful identity work and meaning-making in different communicative contexts.

Explorations in this vein are also essential for understanding increased diversity as U.S. demographic and immigration patterns change. The traditional divide between white, middle-class suburbs where general American English is spoken and urban ethnic enclaves with
stigmatized, non-standard “vernacular” and ethnolectal forms, no longer holds (Frey, 2015). Research is particularly needed on vulnerable and understudied communities such as Central American immigrants, the fastest-growing Latino population in the United States, whose numbers have tripled since 1990 but who remain marginalized socially (Stoney & Batalova, 2013) and who have received very little attention in linguistic research.

Sociolinguistic research that reflects these changing realities is essential to avoid misunderstanding and prejudice, particularly in schools. For example, in Montgomery County, Maryland, which borders Washington, D.C. to the north and in whose suburbs many study participants live, Latinos are now the largest student group in early elementary education. This emphasizes the need for research on local language practices, including dialect variation and bilingualism, to raise community awareness, inform teacher training, and prevent potential discrimination. As suburban populations diversify (Frey, 2015), research on minority and immigrant populations in these contexts will be badly needed to increase understanding of non-standard linguistic forms as elements of legitimate language systems which relate to social contact, ethnic affiliation and cultural pride.

6.5 CONCLUSION

This dissertation examined /ae/ realization and stylistic variation in the speech of first- and second-generation Latino immigrants in Washington, D.C., a community undergoing major changes related to gentrification in the city. The study’s implications touch on the relationships between language, identity construction and social contact in contexts of migration. It offers some useful insight into the reciprocal relationships between language structures, interactional practices, and sociolinguistic attitudes and ideologies, which are mediated through discursive
positioning and indexical relationships between linguistic variants and social meanings. It also
has implications for changes in language systems, including the development of contact varieties
with substrate-origin features such as Chicano English. This dissertation makes contributions to
research on Latino Englishes and on Washington, D.C., an understudied site where the social
landscape continues to be transformed by Latino immigration and gentrification. It also furthers
understanding of phonological variation and language practices in D.C. more broadly (Fasold,

Quantitative and qualitative results document non-standard /æ/ realization consistent
with other Latino English varieties (Eckert, 1996, 2008a; Gordon, 2001; Roeder, 2006, 2009);
and its use among speakers is not a consequence of non-native English but is rather a systemic
part of their native English repertoires. Analysis indicates that individual variation may be
related to different degrees of exposure to forms related to educational background (some
attended elite institutions and others did not), but that the form may also be used for identity
work and may have meanings linked but not limited to ethnic orientation. The variant’s stylistic
use may be related to particular topics which are locally and personally relevant, such as change
in D.C., and interactional setting. This study thus offers a perspective on language and identity as
they are highlighted in a particular moment of contact and tension in Washington, D.C. (Eckert,
2011), and provides insight into the relationship between language structure, social factors, and
personal identificational concerns.

Findings showed that speakers were using a native English system with low, backed /æ/
realizations and a weaker nasal-raising pattern consistent with research on Chicano English,
indicating possible shared substrate origin. This was based on statistically-significant results for
linguistic environment and conditioning environments (Hillenbrand, Clark, & Neary, 2001; Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006; Roeder, 2006, 2009), and Pillai scores addressing relative degree of pre-nasal /ae/ raising. Findings indicate an important role for social practice, specifically assimilation, social networks, education, and linguistic exposure. These related to the broader local context in terms of gentrification-related changes in demographic and residency patterns as well as ideological tension. Educational experiences giving access to general American English and ethnic identity orientation may also play a role in individual differences. These findings highlight the importance of social context in understanding patterns of variation and language use, particularly in sociolinguistic contact and interaction, and identity (Eckert, 2000; Rickford, 1986; Santa Ana, 1993).

Speakers’ metalinguistic commentary indicated ethnic identity is potentially related to use of low and backed, “ethnolectal” /ae/ realizations. Evidence that low and backed /ae/ is available for strategic use for identity purposes was apparent in (1) individual speakers’ quantitative style shifting by discourse topic and interactional context, and (2) the style shifting of one particular speaker, whose distributions of sociophonetic features pattern with discursive identity work. Both of these patterns suggest that the social meaning of /ae/ may draw on broader social-category ideologies about linguistic correctness and “types of people” as well as local meanings related but not limited to ethnicity, such as localness and authenticity (Cutler, 2003; Eckert, 1990, 1996; Johnstone, 2010b; Reyes, 2005). The locally-salient demographic changes caused by gentrification invoke broader ideologies of race, place, and social class, and all of these are addressed through Marcos’s multi-level discursive positioning as he develops a moral and discursive claim to the city, and presents an argument about authenticity, belonging, and
exclusion. Potential evidence of multiple indexical meanings for /ae/ and of F1 and F2 operating independently was also found.

These results imply that the ethnolectal feature is based in Spanish transfer. The incorporation of transfer-origin features into emergent linguistic repertoires in bilingual contexts may be mediated by social factors, including access to and attitudes toward language varieties. Although Latinos in D.C. may be exposed to derogatory attitudes toward Latino English(es), they nonetheless retain a positive sense of their unique cultural and linguistic heritage. Low and backed Latino English /ae/—particularly as it contrasts with general American English patterns of /ae/-raising—has become available for nuanced identity work related (but certainly not limited) to ethnicity, and its stylistic use today may have consequences for language practices and processes of language contact and change in future generations.

These findings contribute to sociolinguistic research on language contact, style, repertoire, and identity. They emphasize the importance of interaction and identity (Rickford, 1985), and of language practice as a nexus of identity work and potential change (Eckert, 1990). They deepen our understanding of the social factors that can affect feature transfer and spread in bilingual communities. The study demonstrates the utility of complementary methodologies to address sociolinguistic and sociophonetic research, and the importance of discourse analysis as a productive means of examining identity work and the relationship between linguistic features and social meanings. This research has implications for social influences on phonetic variation and dialect formation in language-contact situations; for variation and style in the speech of bilingual and non-native speakers of English; and for language transfer effects in consecutive generations of speakers. It also has implications for linguistic identity construction, including
cross-generational identity shift and the formation and re-configuration of social categories such as race and ethnicity in contexts of migration and change.

Finally, findings also emphasize the relationship between language and society, and the relevance of local variation to the broader social context. The study points to the need for comparative research on developing Latino and other immigrant communities in suburban and city contexts. Given the tendency for non-standard and ethnolectal language practices to be misunderstood and condemned or mischaracterized as incorrect, uneducated, or learner English, these findings also suggest a need for applications that address linguistic discrimination, social justice, and educational equity. Greater understanding of language variation in the increasingly-diverse suburbs could have a real impact on public awareness and on the educational experiences of new generations of Americans.
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APPENDIX A

Sample sociolinguistics interview questions

The D.C. area and immigration

- How long have you lived in DC?
- Do you feel like you live in DC or do you feel like you live in Virginia, etc.?
- What do you think of the area? Do you like it here?
- If born elsewhere: Do you remember what it was like coming to the States/to DC? Was it a weird transition? Can you tell me what it was like/do you remember any stories about that?
- If grew up here: What was it like growing up here? Can you tell me what it was like/do you remember any stories about that?
- Were there lots of Latino people then? How did people feel about them? Do you think that’s changed?
- Do you stay in touch with where your family is from, do you know a lot about it? Do you still have family there?
- Have you been back? Would you like to go back?

Social networks

- What are your friends like? What do you do for fun? Do you hang out with people from school, work, family members, etc.? Are a lot of them Latino? What are they mostly like?
- Do you spend a lot of time with your family?
- Do you do community activities, sports, music, volunteering, etc.?
• Where did you go to school? What was that like? Can you tell me what it was like/do you remember any stories about that?

• What is your job like?

Ethnic identity

• Is being Latino a big part of your identity? Do you identify as Latino or more like Colombian, etc.?  

• What does being Latino mean to you? What do you think about Spanglish?

• What does being Latino mean to you? Do you think speaking Spanish is important in order to be “Latino”? What do you think about Spanglish?

• Is it important to you that your kids are proud of being Latino and learn about their heritage? That they speak Spanish?

• Do you think it’s different being “Latino” in the States from in ______?

• Do you get “pushback” from other Latino people, or relatives, etc. about your identity, such as being Latino enough/not Latino enough? Can you tell me what it was like/do you remember any stories about that?

• What do you think about the Latino community in DC? Is there one or many? Do you think there are any general stereotypes about Latinos? What do you think about US attitudes about immigration?

• The Latino population is growing so fast, what impact do you think it will have in the United States?

• Have you encountered any stereotyping or racism?

• Do you think these are these common stereotypes?
Language use and proficiency

- Do you speak Spanish?
- How do you feel about your Spanish and English abilities?
- Did you learn Spanish from your parents?
- Do you speak Spanish regularly? With whom?
- Do you mostly speak Spanish at home?
- Did you ever go to school in Spanish?
- How do you feel about Spanglish?
- Do you think there is a D.C. way of talking?
- Do you think there are any stereotypes related to language? What would a stereotype “sound like”??
APPENDIX B

Transcription conventions
Modified from Cashman (2005); De Fina (2003); De Fina & Relaño Pastor (2005).

(.) Noticeable pause
? Rising intonation followed by noticeable pause (as at end of interrogative sentence)
. Falling intonation followed by noticeable pause (as at end of declarative sentence)
, Continuing intonation: may be a slight rise or fall in contour (less than “.”” or “?”); may not be followed by a pause (shorter than “.”” or “?”).
CAPS louder than surrounding talk
- Abrupt cutoff, stammering quality when hyphenating syllables of a word
[ overlapping speech
[ ]
>> Expressive intonation, for example raised or lowered pitch
= no interval between adjacent utterances
[Text] Spanish word or phrase; English translation
[Text]

[Text] Gloss of linguistic feature of interest, i.e. “low back /ae/”, “monophthongal /ay/”,
[Description] “syllable timing”

(hhh) laughter (each “h” represents a beat)
APPENDIX C

Interview excerpts: Marcos

A. Short framing excerpt

A) Amelia A friend of mine put it, you know he was like, what'd he- cause he came here, to the States to D.C. in the seventies [I think, the late seventies, and grew up in that area, you know, Colombia Heights area, and he said "You know(.)"

B) Marcos [Mmhmm.

C) Amelia he said "You know the thing is," with gentrification and stuff, a bunch of people said this they were like "You know, we wanted it to get better. We just didn't think we'd be out- we'd, get left out of it."

D) Marcos [Yeah.

E) Amelia [Like, we wanted it to get BETter this neighborhood used to be [TERRible.

F) Marcos [Yes.

G) Amelia We're GLAD it's getting better we just didn't realize that it was gonna be better for somebody, else.

H) Marcos Yeah.

I) Amelia You know?

J) Marcos And that's where I'm at too, because(.)

K) I- I purchased that home in, in, uh Brookland, in, Eckington whatever you want to call it (.). It, depends on the street.

L) Because I- [I] believed it was gonna get better.

[monophthongal /ay/]

M) Amelia Mmhmm.

N) Marcos And I TOLD you I'd get- come home and, you know after going out with the fellows and, get home and there was, prostitutes still outside. And this is two thousand [three].

[trilled /r/]
Now come two thousand thirteen, you know, you see, uh- the gay couple walking their, fluffy dog. You know, [down the street. You know, it- uh,

O) Amelia         [(hhhh)

P) Marcos         Down by Benning Road, there's a white woman running jogging in the morning.  
                  >What the hell? She's not running for her life?<

Q) Amelia         (hhhhh)

R) Marcos         >It's SO DIFFERENT<(.)

S) Amelia         Yeah.

T) Marcos         Uh, he Children's Museum that I was telling you earlier.

U)               >I have GREAT< memories of going to the Children's Museum.

V)               Now there's a condo.

W)               THAT, I can't afford.

X) Amelia         Mmhmm.

Y) Marcos         Thirty-six hundred, per month, [for- for down there? Are you kidding me?

Z) Amelia         [(whistles) Thirty-six hundred is a lot.

B. Interview excerpt

1) Marcos         Who can afford that?

2)               So YES. Your friend was right.

3)               We- we wanted it(.) We want- this place to be better.

4)               We WANT D.C. to be better.

5)               But I didn't know it was gonna be better for, everyone else.

6)               For, for, the, kids, that you know their parents live in Utah.

7)               Or Wyoming, and, they send their kids over here.

8)               Cause you know, "Oh [go learn about Congress]" and, shit.  

                  [syllable timing ]

9)               And, NOW they're living here and, >I'm not hating on them.<

10)              THAT'S what (claps hands) D.C.'s about.
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11) It's a [melting pot].

[syllable timing]

12) Amelia Mmhmm.

13) Marcos Just SUCKS that we, uh everyone who's, low-income, gets these houses, but they don't apPRECiate it so,

14) THEY'RE also, the CRIMinals and then there's,

15) US, that's in the middle which is a HUGE gap.

16) Amelia Mmhmm.

17) Marcos People that make forty to, a hundred and twenty thousand.

18) Amelia Mmhmm.

19) Marcos That's a [BIG fucking gap].

[syllable timing]

20) That's a big gap.

21) Marcos WE'RE left out.

22) Amelia Yeah.

23) Marcos I'm here, thirty-six years old, married, both, have, Federal, government employees,

24) we're both, combination making, making about two hundred thousand, about? And, I need to have a roommate because I still can't afford my mortgage.


26) Marcos Yeah. Twelve hundred dollars for daycare a month?

27) Amelia (whistles)

28) Marcos Yeah.

29) Amelia That's a lot.

30) Marcos THOSE should be a mortgage.

31) Amelia Yeah that's a lot of [money for daycare.

32) Marcos [But, it's not.

33) Because I-I you know, I have to spend [three] thousand on,

34) mortgage I have to spend [THREE] hundred on, THIS and you have to do THIS and you have,
It's over a hundred dollars to commute to work it's uh,
you have to EAT it's, you know, ten dollars a DAY and, that's just a SANDwich and,
it SUCKS.

Amelia That's a lot.

Marcos =You know we wanted to make better.

I [have] MANY options, we have SO many things to eat.

I can't afford it.

You know I, we have- we- we're- we're- =>we're well<. We're well.

Amelia [Yeah.

Marcos [You know. But, this took a LOT.

This went, to the Marine Corps.

Marcos This was, being, in the weapons platoon, doing, volunteering for, [black] ops

just so I can get extra pay.

Ages twenty-one instead of getting rims on my car and, getting a stereo system, I BOUGHT, a home.

And I bought it in Germantown Maryland.

Because there was farmlands up there.

[King's] Farmland, this and that.

And now there's a Mercedes dealership a SmartCar dealership or a Lamborghini dealership,

Amelia Oh (h) really?= 

Marcos =I sold it, [I], purchased it for, one thirty-five, [I] sold it for over five hundred?

Marcos THAT'S where [I] was fortunate. =
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56) Amelia  =>Wow.<=
57) Marcos  =You know, I- I, I- wasn't STUPID with my money, at an early age.
58)        Because of what I learned in D.C.
59)        Uh- you know I learned morals.
60)        I got my values from here, and they weren't-
61)        YEAH they were, somewhat hustler-ish or street-ish,
62)        WHATEVER. I just learned to take care of my >[FAMILY]<
           [low /æ/]
63) Amelia  Mmhmm.
64) Marcos  And to take care of others.
65) Amelia  Mmhmm.
66)        You know and, and I moved back into D.C. and I bought my mom's home, and,
67)        uh she lives out THERE where,
68)        I had enough money to put into the condo and I sold that and,
69)        met [my] wife and now I live here in Petworth and.
       [monophthongal /ay/]
70)        It's because uh- I chose [Petworth and- and I didn't choose like Upper
        Northwest] because,
       [syllable timing]
71)        I believe this is gonna get better and I BELIEVE that my kid can go
down the park and be, in a soccer team.
72) Amelia  Yeah.=
73) Marcos  =I don't [have] to BE, off of Sixteenth Street or F, you know, up- up the street on,
           [low /æ/]
74) Marcos  You shouldn't have to do that.
75)        You know, I did a lot of community service.
76)        I've PAINTED Malcom- you know, uh, SEVERAL,
77) Amelia  [Mmhmm.
78) Marcos  [Uh elementary schools?
Amelia: Oh cool.

Marcos: These are MARYLAND, fraternities University of Maryland, sororities that you know would come in and [I] would go with THEM.

[monophthongal /ay/]

And, my friends were in college I wasn't but I joined them, to go do community things for here.

Amelia: Mmhmm.

Marcos: =>Where's the community people are helping here?<

Amelia: "Well this ain't my community I'm just here for two years."

Marcos: Mmhmm.

Amelia: And, my friends were in college I wasn't but I joined them, to go do community things for here.

Marcos: There's a lot of TRANsient people.

Amelia: Mmhmm.

Marcos: So they come here to, take advantage of everything that's given to them, but they don't, contribute.

Amelia: Mmhmm.

Marcos: Not everyone. But the majority do. DID that.

Amelia: But it's like their life isn't part of the community.

Marcos: They're- Yeah. "We're just here."

Amelia: Yeah.

Marcos: "Oh this place sucks" everybody complains well what have you done, to make this place better?

Amelia: Mmhmm.

Marcos: There ARE your few. There ARE. There ARE that m-, have made it better.

Amelia: That's cool.

Marcos: And, we want to make it better.

HE'S lived in D.C. his whole life too.

Marcos: And, HE owns the restaurant his brother runs the, the- the kitchen and,

Amelia: That's cool.

Marcos: And, we want to make it better.
That's in Adams Morgan.

Amelia  Yeah.

Marcos  You know. So all these things, you know, we're all here, we're not all, just running away from it.

We want to make it better but, we have to WORK twenty-four seven, and we don't get to enJOY it? [And WE’RE Washingtonians.

Amelia  [Mhhmm.

It DOES hurt.

Amelia  Yeah that sucks.=

Marcos  =You know? It DOES suck.

Amelia  Then you see all- and then, yeah you see- you get the kids with the knives and you're like >"Man we're working so hard<, [and it’s, what's- what's it doing"

Marcos  [>Yeah.<

Like, YOU'RE giving it a bad image.

YOU'RE just here to kind of leech off of it and move on once you leave,

Amelia  Uhuh.

Marcos and go [back to Vermont] or wherever YOU'RE from,

[syllable timing]

AND, [I'm] stuck here with the trash.

[I'm] here with the leftovers.

[I'm] here with the leftovers.

Amelia  Mhhmm.

Marcos  Um,that hurts.

Why didn't they update and upgrade the Children's Museum.

They just put in condos, and, [to people that make, WAY too much money.

Amelia  [>Yeah. That SUCKS.<

That SUCKS they would have moved it from like such a, central, city location.

Marcos  Uuhh. Libraries, schools, I mean the schools sucked here.

That's why I never went to school here.
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I was always, I, we would use a fake address in D.- in Maryland.

I would go to Maryland schools.

Amelia Mhmmm.

You know I, I had to commute an hour and a half, two hours to get to school, [cause I lived in D.C.,

Amelia [Mhmmm, mmhmm.

but, I wasn't gonna get educated in here. There- it was a horrible education.

The police here, THEY don't know how to treat people here from D.C.

The police force is from Iowa from, you know you got this corn-fed kid, you know arresting people in D.C.,

there's gonna be, judgmental.

They're GONNA be, racist.

Because- it's not their fault, just [that's] how they were raised. [back /ae/]

(hhh)

They should be, sherriffing or doing whatever in THEIR towns.

You know? You got the- that quarterback star that got hurt and he comes over here,

He's got a chip on his shoulder.

That's why we don't like cops.

We DON'T like cops here.

Mhmmm.

You know, [that's] the [last] thing I said you know, if they, when, if, [low /ae/] [back /ae/]

something [happened] we would, keep it in house. [back /ae/]

We would take care of it in house.

[Mhmmm.

[We wouldn't call the police.

What good are THEY gonna do.
Amelia  (h) It's just stir everything up for everybody else.

Marcos  =That's it.

When stuff [happens] even in HERE, you- NOW, you'll see neighbors come out

[/h/ raising]

and be like "Hey, man, what's wrong."

Because, you're concerned for your fellow [neighbor.

Amelia  [Mmhmm.

Marcos  You call the police, they're gonna come in and just arrest them.

Amelia  [Mmhmm.

Marcos  [What GOOD is that gonna do. NO, none.

Uh we should have, mental health, we should have more clinics we should have people to help OUT the community.

You know [I] would take my friends out like,

[monophthongal /ay/]

[and they would be freaked out], "[I] don't know who [I] slept with, this and this and that"

[syllable timing] [monophthongal /ay/][monophthongal /ay/]

I'd take them down to the Whitman Walker clinic.

Amelia  Mmhmm.

Marcos  "Let's go get you tested [man]."

[back /ae/]

Amelia  Mmhmm.

Marcos  Those- that's the community that I remember not just, [throwing] them away and [trilled /r/]

and, you know running away from other people.

You know those were the things that were- I miss from D.C.

And that's what we [try] to celebrate here in the area.

[monophthongal /ay/]

Like the, death with uh, um, the- when Chuck Brown died, you saw the community [come toGETHER you know,
Amelia

[>Yeah.<

EVERybody came together< and other people just out of curiosity, [came together.

Amelia

[Yeah.

Marcos

But that was the beauty of it. THAT would happen, on the DAILY.

Amelia

But like Union Market- Union Market?

Marcos

Yeah.

Amelia

That's up and coming- but NOW do you see who's coming IN the,

Marcos

Outsiders.

Amelia

Uuhh.

Marcos

Who started Union Market.

Amelia

=D.C., Washingtonians=Locals.

Marcos

Now who's doing it. "Oh, New England Chowder." Eh? This (.)

Amelia

(hhhhh)

Marcos

What? Ah.

Amelia

WE always joke and we want to make soul food and this and this and that,

Marcos

because that's the D.C. we remember, [had, cultural food.

Amelia

[Uhuh.

Marcos

You know making, [empanada pupusas] but also [having] cauliflower green- and [Mexican, Salvadoran foods] [back /æ/]

greens on the side[ too.

Amelia

[Uuhh.

Marcos

>That's< D.C. A fusion.

Chocolate City?

We used to be Chocolate City.

Nobody knows who Chocolate City is.

THAT was D.C.
198) Amelia Uhuh.
199) Marcos Chocolate City.
200) It was an infusion of whatever culture you had with, the [black] culture. [low /ae/]

201) Amelia Mmhmm.
202) Marcos You know D.C. WAS [BLACK]. [low back /ae/]

203) NOW, it's, hipster.
204) Amelia (hhhhhh) It is [hipster.
205) Marcos [Now it's, uh you know velour this and that and,
206) Amelia [((hhhh)
207) Marcos [Huh? Hey I'm,
208) uh I fell into it too, you saw how [I] was dressed, [monophthongal /ay/]

209) I had my blazer with my plaid, crap on, [that's not me.]
210) Amelia [((hhhh)
211) Marcos You know, I- I did that because we were going out.
212) And you know, you gotta blend in.
213) Amelia Yeah you gonna go to the W Hotel, [(hhh)
214) Marcos [Yeah, going to the W Hotel,
215) uh because- and to- and to take those luxuries, I [have] to play, like I'm one of [low /ae/]

them.
216) Just to have fun in my city?
217) Amelia (hhhhhh)
218) Marcos [That's] pretty bad.= [low /ae/]
219) Amelia =That's WEIRD, yeah.=
220) Marcos =Yeah, [I] have to, imitate someone, that [I'm] not. [monophthongal /ay/][monophthongal /ay/]
221) Amelia That's true.
222) Marcos And, before, it was an honor to be who [I] was.

[monophthongal /ay/]

223) You know so, I'm [glad] I'm- I look like a mutt,

[back /ae/]

224) you know because I'm not,
225) judged, right off the bat.
226) “OH, he's Salvadorian he's this and this and this.”
227) Amelia Mmhmm.
228) Marcos “Oh he's Mexican” this and this and this and this.
229) They're like, “I don't know what he is.”
230) Amelia (hhhhh)
232) Amelia (hhhh)
233) Amelia [They can't tell?]
234) Marcos [And [I’m] a chameleon.

[monophthongal /ay/]

235) But that's something else D.C. taught me.
236) Uh I go, but talk with New Yorkers,
237) I- I'll pick up the [accent] and I'll talk like them and their [slang].

[low /ae/] [back /ae/]

238) In D.C. I'll pick up, our slang and [I] do what I need to do.

[monophthongal /ay/]

239) Amelia Mmhmm.
240) Marcos And that- you know you just LEARN to adapt.
241) Amelia Uuhh.
242) Marcos So, to see the people, the YOUNGER, generation, NOT adapt and their [pants]

[low /ae/]

down to their ass,
243) it's disgusting.
Amelia (hhh)

Marcos It's disgusting to me.

Because what did THEY adopt.

Marcos Where would- where did that [HAPPen]? [low /æ/]

And we had little CREWS and this and that but we always had respect for others.

Amelia Mmhmm.

Marcos You know and, and it was lost.

[That] was my thing. I love D.C. but,

[low /æ/]

um, it's- there- it has its good and its bad.

I hate like the smoke and mirrors of illusion that it's this, this, and, luxury and this and that, but it's not.