

## The role of phonology in discerning lone other-language items as borrowing or codeswitches

This study furthers our understanding of lone other language items (LOLIs) in bilingual discourse and their status as either borrowings or codeswitches by measuring the degree of incorporation of LOLIs as an indicator. To accomplish this aim, nouns from 40 sociolinguistic interviews from 8 Spanish monolingual speakers from Sonora, Mexico, 8 English monolingual speakers from Arizona, and 24 Spanish-English bilinguals from Arizona (from Sonoran families) are compared.

Borrowing involves the incorporation of LOLIs from a donor language into the recipient language, while code-switching items are produced without adaptation (Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller 1988; Sankoff, Poplack, and Vanniarajan 1990). Historically, variationist studies analyze integration in terms of degree of morphological and syntactic convergence (Poplack and Meechan, 1995, 1998; Torres Cacoulios and Aaron 2003; Poplack and Dion 2012; Aaron 2014; among others), while phonological integration is discarded for being too variable and an unreliable indicator (i.e. Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller 1988; Sankoff, Poplack, and Vanniarajan 1990); Torres Cacoulios and Aaron 2003; Aaron 2014).

The present investigation applies the sociolinguistic comparative method to LOLIs by comparing nouns in monolingual Spanish (recipient language) and in English (donor language) with the LOLIs produced by English-Spanish bilinguals while speaking in Spanish. Furthermore, we explore if phonological integration is correlated to morphosyntactic integration of LOLIs.

Following Torres Cacoulios and Aaron (2003), we test the probability of whether a determiner is realized in a LOLI-headed NP based on several linguistic factors: specificity, grammatical function, use of a modifier, string position, polarity, and semantic class. Using a regression analysis, we compare the constraint hierarchies of the factors that condition determiner usage for Spanish monolingual speech (N=400), Spanish bilingual speech in monolingual Spanish mode (N=400), English LOLIs in Spanish bilingual speech (N=797), English bilingual speech in monolingual English mode (N=400), and finally English monolingual speech (N=400). The results show that LOLIs act morphosyntactically like Spanish words. For instance, LOLIs in subject position highly favor the use of a determiner, following the Spanish pattern.

Also tested is the correlation between morphosyntactic and phonological integration (phonology based on a perception study involving the investigator and 19 monolingual English participants) of LOLIs by comparing LOLIs produced with Spanish phonology versus LOLIs produced with English phonology. Quantitative results show that phonological integration significantly correlates with morphosyntactic integration: LOLIs with Spanish phonology are more morphosyntactically similar to Spanish words and LOLIs with English phonology are more morphosyntactically similar to English words. For example, in English and among LOLIs with English phonology, institutional (i.e. *school*) nouns favor the bare form, but Spanish nouns and LOLIs with Spanish phonology favor the use of a determiner.

These findings suggest that phonological integration is a factor that should be brought back into the classification of LOLIs. The novelty of this paper is threefold: the incorporation of relevant monolingual control groups, the consideration of phonology as a factor in classifying LOLIs, and the perception study used to determine if a LOLI is produced with Spanish or English phonology.

References:

- Aaron, J. E. (2014). Lone English-origin nouns in Spanish: The precedence of community norms. In C. Travis & R. Torres Cacoullós (Eds.), *International Journal of Bilingualism, Special issue*, doi:10.1177/1367006913516021.
- Poplack, S. (1993). Variation theory and language contact. In D. R. Preston (Ed.), *American dialect research*, 251-286. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Poplack, S & Dion, N. (2012). Myths and facts about loanword development. *Language Variation and Change*, 24(3), 279-315.
- Poplack, S, & Meechan, M. (1998). Introduction: How languages fit together in codemixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(2), 127-138.
- Poplack, S., & Meechan, M. (1995). Patterns of language mixture: Nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse. In P. Muysken & L. Milroy (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages*, 199–232. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Poplack, S. & Sankoff, D. (1984). Borrowing: the synchrony of integration. *Linguistics*, 22, 99-135.
- Poplack, S., Sankoff, D., & Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics*, 26, 47-104.
- Sankoff, D., Poplack, S., & Vanniarajan, S. (1990). The case of the nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change*, 2(1), 71-101.
- Torres Cacoullós, R., & Aaron, J. E. (2003). Bare English-origin nouns in Spanish: Rates, constraints, and discourse function. *Language Variation and Change*, 15, 289-328.