Variants of intervocalic /d/ as markers of sociolinguistic identity among Spanish-Portuguese bilinguals
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The border shared by Brazil and Uruguay represents a situation of sustained, intimate cultural and linguistic contact between Spanish and Portuguese speakers. Previous research on the bilingualism of this region has focused primarily on *Dialectos Portugueses del Uruguay* 'Portuguese Dialects of Uruguay’ (DPU) (Carvalho 1998, 2003a, 2003b; Elizaincín 1976, 1992a, 1992b; Elizaincín, Behares & Barrios 1987; Hensey 1971, 1972; Rona 1965). Surprisingly, however, the Spanish of Uruguay spoken along this border has never been extensively studied. The current research focuses on the role of sociolinguistic identity in the conditioning of language-specific variants of intervocalic /d/ in the Spanish of 63 bilinguals living in Rivera, Uruguay. Unlike in monolingual varieties of Spanish, in which intervocalic /d/ is realized as either a fricative or a phonetic zero, this phoneme is also variably realized as an occlusive in the bilingual Spanish of Rivera in accordance with Portuguese phonological norms. Perceptions of sociolinguistic identity within this speech community are based on four independent factor groups. These are: (1) frequency of language use, (2) language preference, (3) attitudes toward local Portuguese and (4) attitudes toward language mixing. Results from multivariate analysis reveal that Portuguese-dominant speakers tend to incorporate occlusive variants of intervocalic /d/ into their Spanish to a much greater extent than Spanish-dominant speakers. Conversely, the deletion of this consonant, which has garnered covert prestige within the community due to its association with non-border varieties of Spanish, is statistically favored among speakers who prefer this language. These results provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that the ease of access of phonological exemplars from stored memory is greater for those encoding frequent, recent experiences (Pierrehumbert 2001). With regards to sociolinguistic attitudes, statistical analysis shows that speakers who have positive attitudes toward local Portuguese favor the use of occlusive variants, which serve as markers of Brazilian identity. Somewhat counter intuitively, speakers who have positive attitudes toward language mixing favor deletion. When these attitudes are cross-tabulated with speakers’ occupation, however, it becomes clear that only students have overwhelmingly
positive attitudes toward language mixing. Not surprisingly, they are also the least conservative group in the community and lead the way for phonological change (Waltermire 2008).
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1. **Introduction**

The linguistic contact between Spanish and Portuguese along the border of present-day Brazil and Uruguay dates back to the arrival of the first Spanish and Portuguese colonizers to the region in the seventeenth century. Research related to bilingual phenomena in border communities has focused primarily on varieties of Portuguese spoken along the Uruguayan-Brazilian border (referred to alternately in the literature as *Dialectos Portugueses del Uruguay* ‘Portuguese dialects of Uruguay’, hereafter DPU, or *fronterizo*) (Carvalho 1997, 1998, 2003a, 2003b, 2004; Elizaincín 1973, 1976, 1992a, 1992b; Elizaincín, Behares & Barrios 1987; Hensey 1971, 1972; Rona 1965). Surprisingly, “the variety of Spanish spoken in these bilingual border communities has not been investigated” (Carvalho 2006: 154).1 The largest concentration of bilingual speakers in Uruguay is found in Rivera, which is located directly across from the Brazilian city of Santana do Livramento. Rivera,
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a small city of about 100,000 inhabitants, is located approximately 500 kilometers north of the national capital of Montevideo. A map of Uruguay showing the respective locations of these cities appears in Figure 1.

Despite varying levels of Brazilian kinship ties among community members, the results of cultural contact are evident in the speech patterns of all residents of Rivera. Even the few speakers who claim not to use Portuguese are exposed to this language all the time. The use of Portuguese permeates everyday life in the city. It is heard in the street, spoken in many homes, transmitted over radio and television and is used to communicate with Brazilians within the borders of Uruguay, since relatively few Brazilians on the border speak Spanish. Due to such intense contact with Portuguese, practically all speakers within the community show some degree of communicative ability in this language, thereby making it an ideal site for the research of language contact phenomena.

2. Data collection

Fieldwork for the current investigation was conducted in Rivera from mid-March 2003 to mid-May 2003. The purpose of the field work was to create a corpus of urban vernacular Spanish that proportionally represents all social groups living in Rivera. A total of 63 bilingual Spanish-Portuguese speakers residing in the city of Rivera, ranging in age from 16 to 78, were interviewed in Spanish, both in individual and group sessions during 44 interviews for a total of approximately 50 hours of unguided informal conversation. Though the levels of proficiency and frequencies of use of Portuguese differ from speaker to speaker, each of these consultants must be considered bilingual since all claimed at least some level of command of this language.

All interviews consisted of free conversation since no questions were planned prior to the interview session. Consultants, however, were encouraged to speak about topics of great personal and emotional importance. Only in this sense could the interviews be considered guided. A variety of topics were discussed during the interviews, including family, work, border life, pastimes, soccer, politics, Uruguay’s recent economic crisis, local customs, Brazil, other areas of Uruguay and language use. By focusing on interesting, relevant and emotional topics, the speaker’s attention was taken away from the recording apparatus, thereby further circumventing the ‘Observer’s Paradox’ of trying to capture informal speech data in an inherently formal situation (Labov 1972, 1984). These methods of data collection have proven successful in obtaining the most vernacular speech possible, which has been shown to be representative of unmonitored, informal speech styles (Labov 1966a, 1966b, 1972, 1984).
In order to achieve an accurate representation of the linguistic community of Rivera, I chose consultants based on age, sex and occupation proportionately to their actual populations in Rivera proper according to Uruguayan census data from 2003. This information was solicited from each of the consultants by way of a questionnaire that was given to them at least one week after an interview had taken place. This questionnaire appears in its entirety in the appendix.

Table 1 shows the actual number of consultants belonging to each possible social group who were interviewed for the current investigation (S = student, N = non-professional, P = professional). As will be shown, the community sample used for this research represents a microcosm of the actual speech community.

| Table 1. Distribution of social characteristics within the community sample |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                | 1st generation  | 2nd generation  | 3rd generation  | Total           |
|                                | (ages 16–25)    | (ages 26–50)    | (ages 51–78)    |                 |
| Male                           | S   | N   | P   | S   | N   | P   | S   | N   | P   | 28  |
| Female                         | 6   | 2   | 0   | 7   | 5   | 4   | 4   | 28  |
| Total                          | 12  | 4   | 2   | 15  | 12  | 4   | 14  | 63  |

Although a roughly equal number of consultants were chosen to fill each of these generation categories, there is a slightly higher representation of community members belonging to the second generation. A total of 27 consultants between the ages 26 and 50 were interviewed while only 18 consultants were interviewed from the oldest and youngest generations. The greater representation of speakers from the second generation accurately reflects the greater number of these speakers throughout Uruguay. According to 2003 Uruguayan census data (República Oriental del Uruguay), there are 1,104,388 Uruguayans between the ages of 25 and 49 while only 530,233 were from the first generation (ages 15 through 24) and 820,654 were from the third generation (ages 50 through 76). The same number of consultants (N = 18) for first and third generations was selected due to the variety of occupations held by members of the first generation, which will be discussed shortly.

The selection of consultants by sex was also based on 2003 Uruguayan census data, but for Rivera (República Oriental del Uruguay). According to these data, the female population of Rivera (N = 53,430) slightly outnumbers that of males (N = 51,491). This demographic trend is also consistent for the entire Uruguayan population. The same statistics also show that women live longer than men on average. With this in mind, a greater number of women were interviewed than men. Out of the 63 total consultants interviewed for the corpus, 35 are women and 28 are men.
Unfortunately, no census data were readily available for occupations within the community. This being the case, three occupational designations for the selection of consultants were chosen: professional, non-professional and student. These designations are general enough to encompass all possible professions within Rivera. Professional refers to any member of the community that practices an occupation requiring advanced training and/or education. Professionals (N = 28) include educators, lawyers, doctors, health inspectors and engineers. Non-professionals of the community (N = 23) work in professions that do not require advanced education. They are hotel owners and their employees, shopkeepers and their employees, secretaries, police officers, currency exchangers, waiters, street vendors and taxi drivers. Though the majority of members of the first generation are students (N = 12) due to their age, six of the younger consultants had already entered the local workforce at the time of interviews. In order to achieve an accurate representation of professions for this generation, fewer professionals (N = 2) and non-professionals (N = 4) were selected than students. The only two social groups not represented for this speech community are first generation male professionals and third generation female non-professionals. Though considerable energy was expended in locating and interviewing speakers from these groups, I was unfortunately unable to do so and therefore will not be able to make any specific claims with regards to their language use.

3. Language-specific variants of intervocalic /d/ in border Spanish

In the Spanish of Rivera, there is considerable interference from Portuguese in the articulation of intervocalic /d/. The realization of this consonant as a voiced dental occlusive (e.g. [ká.da], cada ‘each/every’) is obligatory in Brazilian Portuguese (Amaral de Medeiros Vieira 1988: 83; Azevedo 1981: 31–4; Delgado Martins 1988: 71–2; Stavrou 1947: 25–6) in this context. In many dialects (such as those of São Paolo, Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais and Bahia), however, the use of a palatalized variant is common in the following phonological environments: (1) before /e/ in final syllables (realized as [i]), (2) before /i/ in syllable onsets, (3) in the preposition de ‘of/from’ and (4) in pre-consonantal syllable codas, which often includes a concomitant epenthesis of [i] or [i] between the two consonants. Though /d/ is realized as [dʒ] in these contexts in many dialects of Brazilian Portuguese, its pronunciation as an occlusive is also common in much of southern Brazil, including in border varieties (Carvalho 1998; Koch, Klasmann & Altenhofen 2002: 107, 123; Lipski 1994: 343; Thun & Elizaincín 2000b).

Intervocalic /d/ is realized variably as a fricative ([ð]) or a phonetic zero ([ø]) in monolingual dialects of Spanish (Barrutia & Schwegler 1994: 114–17; Piñeros
Variability in the use of these phones is also common in monolingual varieties of Uruguayan Spanish, in which “intervocalic /d/ elides frequently in all registers of speech” (Lipski 1994: 341). The deletion of intervocalic /d/ is most frequent in unstressed syllables, especially when occurring in the past participle morphemes -ado (as in hinchado ‘swollen’) and -ido (pulido ‘polished/refined’) (Bybee 2001: 148–53; D’Introno & Sosa 1986). Though associated with non-border varieties of Spanish, the deletion of intervocalic /d/ is also common in the Spanish of some bilingual speakers in Rivera.

Due to contact with Portuguese in the contact variety of Rivera, the variable articulation of intervocalic /d/ as an occlusive occurs in the Spanish of these speakers, as shown in examples (1) through (5).

1. pude ‘I could/was able to’ → [pú.de] (38/A:160/60)
2. todo ‘all/everything’ → [tó.do] (09/A:218/09)
3. educación ‘education’ → [e.du.ka.sjón] (32/A:158/50)
4. de diez ‘from ten’ → [de.djés] (34/A:355/53)
5. separadas ‘separated (pl. fem.)’ → [se.pa.rá.das] (23/B:354/30)

Not a single palatalized variant of intervocalic /d/ was encountered in the database, though this articulation was expected prior to data collection. This is due to relative infrequency of this realization of intervocalic /d/ in local varieties of Portuguese.

Given the frequency with which speakers in Rivera use occlusive articulations of intervocalic /d/, they are conscious of the differences between border varieties of Spanish, which they associate with Portuguese influence, and those of Montevideo. Several consultants commented on the difference between articulations of intervocalic /d/ in the Spanish of Rivera and Montevideo. Two of these comments appear below in examples (6) and (7).

6. …queda, eh …, afilada la /d/; yo digo, eso es lo que nos da problemas
   ‘…the /d/ [here in Rivera] is, uh …, sharp; I mean, that’s what gives us problems’ (13/A:200–2/13)
7. Se arrastran las /d/s más [acá, en comparación al Montevideano]
   ‘the /d/s are dragged more [here, in comparison to Montevidean Spanish]’
   (17/A:406/23)

Though the description of /d/ in these commentaries is very general, they exemplify the fact that speakers in Rivera are aware of the linguistic forms they use, especially those that have resulted from contact with Portuguese, thereby distinguishing them from monolingual forms. This perception of language-specific
allophones as essentially divergent is reinforced by the intimate contact situation in Rivera, in which there is daily interaction between Uruguayans and Brazilians.

Though the use of language-specific articulations of intervocalic /d/ in the Spanish of Rivera is conditioned by social factors such as age, sex and occupation (see Waltermire 2008), it is highly likely that the use of language-specific articulations of /d/ is also conditioned by less commonly analyzed usage and attitudinal factors. Though the assessment of community-wide patterns of language use is important, the finer details of individuals’ language use are obscured in such an analysis. Even speakers of similar social backgrounds show remarkable variation in their frequency of use of both languages. For example, two young female speakers with similar educational backgrounds may display completely different rates of language use. As such, the choice of one language or another seems to be largely a matter of individual preference and may be more closely related to personal factors such as feelings of national, social and cultural identity. As Myers-Scotton states, “linguistic choices can be explained as individually motivated negotiations of identity” (1979: 360). This being the case, the goal of the current investigation is to examine patterns of conditioning in speakers’ variable use of language-specific realizations of intervocalic /d/ as they relate to frequency of language use, language preference and attitudes toward both language mixing and local varieties of Portuguese.

4. Language use

The analysis of language use by each consultant is crucial to the sociolinguistic analysis of bilingual communities due to the plethora of evidence that suggests that individual speakers access phonological forms based on exemplars in stored memory (Bybee 2001: 51–4; Miller 1994; Pierrehumbert 1994, 2001; Vitevich, Luce, Charles-Luce & Kemmerer 1997). The frequency with which these forms are accessed varies greatly from speaker to speaker and does not seem to be directly related to traditional social factors such as age, sex, occupation, education, etc. Following Bybee (2001: 29), “the phonological shape of all words and frequent phrases that a person uses are stored in memory along with information about their meaning and contexts of use”. Frequently accessed phonological variants are strengthened in a speaker’s stored memory, thereby making the access of these items more efficient. Pierrehumbert refers to this memory strength and corresponding ease of access as a ‘resting activation level’, which is higher for “exemplars encoding frequent, recent experiences” than for “exemplars encoding infrequent and temporally remote experiences” (2001: 141).

These findings are of particular relevance to any study of bilingual speech since speakers have access to additional linguistic forms. In the case of Spanish
and Portuguese, though the vast majority of these forms are graphemically similar, and in many cases identical, their phonological realizations are highly divergent. Therefore, Spanish-Portuguese bilinguals have access to multiple distinct phonological realizations of the same word, which are strengthened in the mental lexicon relative to the frequency of use of each one. For example, if a speaker uses Spanish more frequently than Portuguese, s/he will be able to access phonological forms from this language more efficiently due to the relative strength of phonological representations of Spanish lexical items in stored memory. In other words, it seems that the more frequently a speaker uses a particular language, the more s/he will choose phonological variants pertaining to this language.

The use of these articulations, of course, is variable, even for the same speaker. This fact lends even further credence to the idea that the relative strength of mental representations of phonological forms for bilinguals is proportionate to the frequencies with which they use each language. It is precisely due to the fact that bilingual speakers use both languages that phonological influence from these languages manifests itself phonologically in their speech. This claim is evident in the theories proposed by Weinreich (1968) that the phonological repertoire of L1 consistently alters the patterns of realization of phonemes in L2 (or what he refers to as phonological transfer). That is, if speakers use their first language almost exclusively or, say, learn this language after the critical period, they will invariably realize articulations in accordance with the patterns of L1 since these patterns are firmly entrenched in stored memory due to constant mental access and strengthening. I propose that if a speaker uses both languages on a daily basis, that a competing influence of phonological and lexical forms exists in the memory of speakers. The more often a speaker uses a language, the more likely it will be that s/he uses the phonological articulations that characterize this language.

In order to operationalize speakers’ varying frequencies of language use, they were categorized according to percentages of use provided through the use of the questionnaire that appears in the appendix. Although percentages of language use by consultants were solicited for a variety of linguistic domains, only percentages given for work and home environments were included in final tabulations since they are the environments where consultants reported spending the majority of their time. Self-reported percentages of language use with different interlocutors were included only when applicable (i.e. no responses were given for the interlocutor category hijos ‘children’ for respondents who do not have children, etc.). These percentages were then averaged for all speakers. The majority of speakers (N = 33) indicated that they use Spanish 80% of the time or more overall. Fewer speakers indicated that they use this language less than 80% of the time, with 17 speakers indicating that they speak Spanish between 40% and 80% of the time and only 7 speakers indicating that they use this language less than 40% of the time. Speakers
in these latter two groups are expected to show more influence from Portuguese in the realization of intervocalic /d/ than speakers who reported using Spanish 80% of the time or more. These speakers have less access to the phonological forms of Portuguese, since they do not use this language often, and are predicted to follow the phonological norms of monolingual varieties of Uruguayan Spanish, in which the use of fricative and zero realizations of intervocalic /d/ predominate.

5. Language preference

Language preference is the choice that a speaker would make concerning the use of a language if external pressures to use a certain language were absent from a given linguistic situation. For every bilingual, the opportunity to choose between two languages is not always acceptable given certain social parameters. Of course, the bilingual speaker is capable of using either language at any given moment, but only when the linguistic situation merits the use of a particular language will the speaker choose that language. Unlike frequencies of use of both languages, which were solicited directly through a questionnaire, language preference was determined for each consultant through the strict analysis of discourse data from interviews along with the author's knowledge of these preferences. The qualitative analysis of discourse data has been effective in the determination of attitudes and perceptions of identity in other studies (Coupland & Jaworski 2004: 20; Giles & Coupland 1991: 53; Hoare 2001; Hyrkstedt & Kalaja 1998: 346–348) and has been extended here to language preferences. Soliciting information related to speakers' language preferences by way of a questionnaire is highly unreliable due to the fact that most consultants associate preference with language use. As we shall see, these two factors do not neatly coincide for all speakers.

Considering that each interview for the current database consists of at least one hour of unguided conversation, in which the discussion of language consistently surfaced, a wealth of metalinguistic data concerning language preferences was supplied by most speakers. Whenever possible, metalinguistic commentaries, such as those appearing in examples (8) through (10), were used to determine a speaker's language preference (I=interviewer, C=consultant).

(8)  I: ¿Qué uso tú hacés del español?  
    ‘When do you use Spanish?’
C: Yo, para vender sólo.  
    ‘I only use it for business.’
I: ¿Sólo para vend …?  
    ‘Only for bus …?’
C: Sólo para vender. Cuando voy [?], cuando, cuando voy por allí, porque acá hablo más en brasileño.
‘Only for business. When I go [?], when, when I go over there, because here I speak more in Portuguese.’
I: Claro.
‘Of course.’
C: Hablo más en brasileño que en español. Y soy uruguayo.
‘I speak more in Portuguese than in Spanish. And I am Uruguayan.’

(25/B:252–256/40)6

Ahora, yo … toda mi vida, hablé portugués. Pero, porque mi madre era de (?) portugués, gallego-portugués. Ahora, desde que me casé, no hablé una sola palabra del portugués, porque mi señora [lo siento, pero mi padre], ella habla, en castellano [no hablaba el brasileño].
‘Now, I … all my life, I spoke Portuguese. But, because my mother was (?) Portuguese, Galician-Portuguese. Now, since I got married, I haven’t spoken a single word of Portuguese, because my wife [I’m sorry, but my father], she speaks Spanish [didn’t speak Portuguese].’ (38/B:228–233/60)

Nosotros hab …, hablamos el castellano con fluidez, y el, y el brasileño, o, o medio brasilerado con fluidez también. Entendemos mucho, pero … difícil es hablarlo.
‘We sp …, we speak Spanish fluently, and, and Portuguese, or, or half (mixed) Portuguese, fluently also. We understand a lot, but … it’s difficult to speak it.’ (17/A:069–71/24)

As shown by these examples, language use and preference do not completely co-incide. Consultant 40 (in example 8) explains that he prefers to speak Portuguese. This speaker, who was interviewed at a cameló (a makeshift vending booth) on the border, not only expressed a preference for Portuguese, but laughed at the prospect of speaking Spanish with close friends. It is clear from these comments that, although he uses Spanish to communicate with the researcher, he feels more comfortable speaking Portuguese and only uses Spanish when the need to communicate with monolingual Spanish-speaking customers arises. Linguistic necessity, though only slightly altering the language choices of this speaker, has completely changed the patterns of language use for consultant 60 (example 9). This speaker, though having grown up speaking Portuguese, now speaks Spanish with his wife and son, since neither of them speaks Portuguese. Though this consultant most likely uses Spanish more often than Portuguese, he told me after the interview was conducted (as did his friend who introduced us) that he speaks only Portuguese with friends and other family members because he still feels more comfortable speaking this language. Despite speaking Spanish 76% of the time in his daily life,
he only does so out of necessity, and in fact more closely identifies with Portuguese than with Spanish.

Though seemingly self-contradictory, the remarks made by consultant 24 in example (10) depict a common situation for many speakers in Rivera, especially students. Though they understand Portuguese and are able to communicate in this language, it is more difficult for them to speak it. In these cases, language use actually does coincide with preference. The reverse is also true for a handful of speakers, who would have rather spoken Portuguese during their interviews and were relieved to be able to speak this language once their respective interview sessions had ended. Their language preferences were apparent from not only their actions, but also in comments made after the interviews were conducted. Speaker 21, for example, told me that he was glad to be able to speak Portuguese again after the interview, revealing a clear preference for this language. If a consultant did not reveal any language preference through overt comments such as these (either during an interview session or afterwards), overall percentages of language use were used to determine language preference. This was the case for only three consultants. Table 2 shows the distribution of participants among different Use/Preference language pairs.

Table 2. Language use and preference for all consultants (N = 57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use/Preference</th>
<th># of consultants</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Spanish</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Portuguese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese/Spanish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese/Portuguese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that, despite the fact that the majority of consultants use Spanish more often than Portuguese and also prefer this language, there is a considerably well-represented group of speakers who use Spanish more often than Portuguese but prefer to use Portuguese (N = 9). For a variety of social reasons, including pressures to use Spanish in official domains and with children, these consultants are forced to use Spanish due to its official status rather than as a result of personal preference.

6. Language attitudes

The hypothesis that relative frequencies of language use condition the use of language-specific phonological articulations fails to address the social parameters of
human existence and assumes a primarily cognitive motivation for the use of phonological forms. If a speaker truly can choose the forms that s/he uses, then his or her attitudes toward both languages and their cultural, ethnic and social values, all of which are largely personal, will also affect their use. For this reason, we will now turn to the analysis and discussion of sociolinguistic attitudes and their impact on the use of language-specific phonological variants.

Unlike gathering data regarding frequencies of language use directly from consultants via a questionnaire, soliciting language attitudes in this manner poses serious methodological problems. Following Poplack, “by administering a questionnaire, the researcher not only predefines the possible attitudes that can be elicited (for closed questionnaires), but also the particular areas in which the respondent is permitted to express them (even in response to open-ended questions)” (1993:270). Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, self-report responses do not always accurately reflect a speaker’s linguistic perceptions and are considered to be notoriously unreliable (Auer, Hinskens & Kerswill 2005:251; Chin & Wigglesworth 2007; Coulmas 2005:152). Unfortunately, the display of positive attitudes may be a face-saving strategy and may not reflect a speaker’s actual attitudes. By soliciting data indirectly in relatively informal settings, consultants are able to express themselves freely, even if they express negative sentiments about some aspect of their community. Given the limitations of self-report approaches, language attitudes were determined through the analysis of metalinguistic commentary supplied by speakers during interviews.

Since one goal of the investigation was to assess language attitudes, discussions about language mixing and the use of Portuguese/DPU were implicitly encouraged when those topics arose during the interviews. The most common topic of discussion relevant to the assessment of these attitudes was that of the correctness or acceptability of speaking Portuguese or DPU in Rivera. Related to this were discussions of the appropriateness and/or prestige of mixing languages, to which few consultants responded positively. These questions are central to the investigation of Spanish in Rivera and may be crucial to the determination of how linguistic attitudes condition the use of loan articulations from Portuguese or the use of prestige variants from Spanish in this bilingual community. Since linguistic attitudes are a manifestation of a speaker’s sociolinguistic identity (Ben-Rafael, Olshtain & Geijst 1998; Hoare 2001; Joseph 2004:71; Lawson & Sachdev 2004), each consultant was assigned a positive or negative value with regards to two distinct, yet related, linguistic attitudes. These were: (1) attitude toward local varieties of Portuguese and (2) attitude toward language mixing.6

The majority of consultants (N = 55) conveyed positive attitudes toward local varieties of Portuguese. The eight consultants who did not view this language positively indicated that this language and its speakers encroach upon what would
be an otherwise more homogenous Uruguayan city. The following exchange illustrates the view held by this minority:

(11) C54: Acá usan demasiado el portugués.
‘People use Portuguese too much here.’
C56: Sí.
‘Yes.’
C54: Más que el español.
‘More than Spanish.’
C55: El portuñol.
‘Portuñol.’
C54: El por …
‘Por …’
I: El portuñol [el portuñol].
‘Portuñol [Portuñol].’
C54: Sí, portugués incluso a veces se haga (?) como es un portuñol, porque es una mezcla, ¿no es? No es puro. No es, ya viene muy modificado, el idioma.
‘Yes, Portuguese, even sometimes it becomes (?) like Portuñol, because it’s a mix, right? It’s not pure. It’s not, it’s already a very modified language.’
‘And it’s noticeable, it’s noticeable in high school and everything, [Yes] when they start, they have greater difficulty. My sister is a teacher. She was seeing how it’s written because, since there was (?) and everything. And, it is noticeable, they make serious errors. They write [mhh] words that don’t, don’t [no, well, they write] don’t exist. In, in, in Spanish they don’t exist.’ (35/A:076–081/54–56)

Consultants 54 and 56, who claim no association with Brazil in this interview, are critical of the influence Portuguese has on the Spanish of their community, claiming that its use is too frequent in Rivera and referring to it as impure (consultant 54) and riddled with errors (consultant 56). For this reason, their attitudes toward not only local varieties of Portuguese, but also those toward language mixing, were coded as being negative.

Linguistic attitudes toward language mixing were coded as negative for any consultant who refers to mixed varieties as uneducated, ungrammatical, poorly spoken or unnatural (N = 32/59 or 54.2%). The most common criticism of Spanish
showing influence from Portuguese among certain community members is that it is poorly spoken. Example (12) aptly exemplifies this critical attitude.

    ‘Like [Spanglish] for us, Spanish and Portuguese.’
    I: *Exacto.*
    ‘Exactly.’
    C38: *Sí.*
    ‘Yes.’
    I: *Exacto. Ehm …*
    ‘Exactly. Uhm …’
    C37: *El problema que tenemos es que, no nos damos cuenta y estamos hablando en portuñol.*
    ‘The problem we have is that, we don’t realize it and we’re speaking Portuñol.’
    I: *Eh, pero el, el, este, el portuñol es más como portugués, ¿no?*
    ‘Uhh, but, well, Portuñol is more like Portuguese, right?’
    C37: *Sí. Es un portugués mal hablado.*
    ‘Yes. It’s poorly spoken Portuguese.’
    I: *Ah.*
    ‘Oh.’
    C38: *Es un español mal hablado. Las dos cosas. Es algo mal hablado.*
    ‘It’s poorly spoken Spanish. It’s both. It’s something poorly spoken.’
    C37: *E, definitivamente es mal hablado.*
    ‘Uhh, it’s definitely poorly spoken.’ (25/A:003–007/37,38)

Though these consultants (like C54 and C56) separate themselves from the rest of the community by claiming a linguistic superiority rooted in monolingual prestige standards, their comments never become an out-and-out insult toward the actual bilingual speakers or so-called *fronterizos* who take pride in identifying linguistically with Brazil. Comments reaching this extreme, though rare, were encountered in the database, however. One of these commentaries appears in example (13).

(13) C47: *Los que mezclan las lenguas y los que hablan [es de bajo nivel] el portuñol son de bajo nivel.*
    ‘Those that mix languages and those that speak [it’s low class] Portuñol are of a low social class’
    C48: *Para nosotros, hablar “tudu” así, ¿viste? “Vai pegar isso ali.” Hablar así …*
    ‘For us, always speaking like that, you know? (Imitates) “He’s gonna get that over there.” To speak like that …’
    I: *Sí.*
‘Yes.’

C48: … para nosotros, es de bajo nivel. O hablás un portugués correcto o un español correcto, o sos [es prestigioso], o sos ordinario.

‘… to us, it’s low class. Either you speak a correct Portuguese or a correct Spanish, or you’re [it’s prestigious], or you’re a commoner.’

(31/A:553–558/47–48)

Though a slight majority of consultants have negative attitudes toward language mixing, many consultants accept this phenomenon as a part of border life and described influence from Portuguese as a natural result of cultural contact. Of all positive expressions of attitudes toward language mixing, this description was without a doubt the most common. Comments in example (14) and (15) exemplify this sentiment.

(14) Como tenemos mucha, influencia del, del Brasil, eh, es, como sabían de cómo hablamos [Sí], de la entonación que tenemos y las palabras que decimos [Sí] porque para nosotros acá en la frontera es normal. Ya es el portuñol.

‘Since we have a lot of, influence from, from Brazil, uh, it’s, like they [residents of Montevideo] knew about how we speak [Yes], about the intonation we have and the words we say [Yes] because for us here on the border it’s normal. It’s portuñol.’

(15) La gente que de Montevideo, mismo de la capital de Montevideo, que (?) sólo sale, hacer su turismo con eso, su paseo (?) para acá para, para Rivera, encuentra ese, ese cambio con las palabras que no entiende, normal, que uno, para mí es normal escuchar, dos personas hablando en portuñol. Para mí es normal.

‘People from Montevideo, even from the capital of Montevideo, that (?) only go out, as tourists, to take a stroll (?) that come here to, to Rivera, find that, that change with words that they don’t understand [to be strange]; but it’s normal, that one, for me it’s normal to listen to two people speaking portuñol. For me it’s normal’

(22/A:067–070/31).

A few speakers, however, view language mixing as not only natural, but as a unique characteristic of being bilingual. According to one consultant,

(16) ...acá, en el norte, se habla permanentemente nuestro lenguaje, especial este, que llaman portuñol.

‘...here, in the north, our special language, that they call portuñol, is spoken consistently’

(38/B:217–219/60).

From each of the metalinguistic comments just presented, it is clear that a wide range of attitudes toward language mixing and the influence of Portuguese exist in Rivera. These attitudes indicate the propensity with which a speaker may be
inclined to use the phonological traits of another language. I hypothesize that a
speaker who views language mixing and local varieties of Portuguese positively
will most likely demonstrate a greater propensity for using loan articulations from
Portuguese whereas one who views them negatively will most likely avoid their
use.

7. The contribution of usage and attitudinal factors to the realization of
   intervocalic \( /d/ \) in Rivera

In order to further explore these predictions, we must first examine the rates at
which consultants use each variant according to frequencies of language use, pref-
erence for either Spanish or Portuguese and attitudes toward both local Portuguese
and language mixing. A total of 2,786 tokens were analyzed for each factor group
except in cases where consultants either did not provide this data (frequency of
language use) or where it could not be determined from their comments (attitudes
toward language mixing). These rates of variant use appear in Table 3.

All four usage and attitudinal factors appear to have a significant effect on the
realization of intervocalic \( /d/ \) as an occlusive. Of these factors, frequency of use of
Spanish seems to have the greatest effect. Consultants who use Spanish only 40%
of the time or less in their daily lives realize intervocalic \( /d/ \) as an occlusive in 171
out of 328 total occurrences (or 52.1%). This is over twice the rate for use of oc-
cclusives by speakers who use Spanish between 40% and 80% of the time (152 out
of 743 total occurrences, or 20.5%) and over five times as frequent as the use of \([d]\)
by consultants who use Spanish 80% of the time or more (a mere 141 out of 1,471
total occurrences, or 9.6%). Similarly, consultants who prefer to speak Portuguese
realize intervocalic \( /d/ \) as an occlusive much more often than those who prefer to
speak Spanish (at a rate of 34.5% compared to only 11%). These results indicate
that frequency of use of a particular language, as well as language preference, has a
direct effect on the use of language-specific phonological forms.

Language attitudes also seem to greatly influence consultants’ choices of lan-
guage-specific phonological variants. Those with positive attitudes toward local
varieties of Portuguese produce loan articulations of intervocalic \( /d/ \) from this
language at a rate of 20.4% (495/2426), compared to only 3% (11/360) for speak-
ers who view them negatively. In other words, in 97% of intervocalic \( /d/ \) contexts,
speakers viewing Portuguese negatively realize \( /d/ \) according to standard Spanish
norms, as either \([\delta]\) (91.7% of the time) or \([\emptyset]\) (5.3% of the time). This suggests
that speakers with negative attitudes toward this language are attempting to dis-
tance themselves from any association with Brazil by using Spanish phonological
articulations almost exclusively. On the other hand, it may be the case that these
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consultants simply want to avoid any stigma associated with incorporating elements of Portuguese in their Spanish. If this were true, though, one would expect similarly low rates of occlusive use among consultants who have negative attitudes toward language mixing. Occlusive /d/ rates among these consultants, however, are considerably higher (at 12.6%) than those for the few speakers that view border Portuguese negatively. Though these rates indicate that all four factor groups may condition occlusive realizations of intervocalic /d/, it is necessary to conduct a multivariate analysis in order to establish a constraint hierarchy. This analysis was performed using GoldVarb 2001, a statistical analysis program that generates probability weights corresponding to observed frequencies in a corpus (Rand & Sankoff 1990). This program determines the contribution that each of the usage

Table 3. Distribution of variant use of intervocalic /d/ according to usage and attitudinal factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Linguistic variant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[ð]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Use</td>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
<td>141/1471</td>
<td>1233/1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.6%)</td>
<td>(83.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% – 80%</td>
<td>152/743</td>
<td>550/743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20.5%)</td>
<td>(74.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 40%</td>
<td>171/328</td>
<td>140/328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(52.1%)</td>
<td>(42.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>214/1939</td>
<td>1605/1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.0%)</td>
<td>(82.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>292/847</td>
<td>509/847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(34.5%)</td>
<td>(60.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>495/2426</td>
<td>1784/2426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward local Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20.4%)</td>
<td>(73.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>11/360</td>
<td>330/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
<td>(91.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>290/1199</td>
<td>823/1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward language mixing</td>
<td></td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
<td>(68.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>181/1431</td>
<td>1173/1431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.6%)</td>
<td>(82.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spanish use: χ² = 330.6160; df = 4; p ≤ .001
Preference: χ² = 218.8305; df = 2; p ≤ .001
Attitudes toward local Portuguese: χ² = 65.8480; df = 2; p ≤ .001
Attitudes toward language mixing: χ² = 67.1519; df = 2; p ≤ .001
and attitudinal factor groups has on the occurrence of a linguistic variant when they are all considered together. GoldVarb then assigns a probability to each factor group in terms of its relative contribution to the occurrence of the selected variant and determines whether the effect of each factor group is statistically significant. Multivariate analysis was conducted using all four usage and attitudinal factor groups in which the dependent variable was occlusive [d]. The results from this analysis are shown in Table 4.

The use of [d] in Rivera is conditioned by all of the usage and attitudinal factors analyzed with the exception of attitudes toward language mixing. The use of this Portuguese loan articulation in the Spanish of the community is most significantly conditioned by the frequency with which speakers use both languages (with a range of 35 between individual factors). The probabilities of use of these articulations are directly parallel to these frequencies. There is a high probability that consultants who speak Spanish 40% of the time or less in their daily lives will realize intervocalic /d/ as a voiced dental occlusive (with a factor weight of .78). The use of this variant by consultants who speak Spanish between 40% and 80% of the time is neither statistically favored nor disfavored (with a factor weight of .50). As suspected, however, the use of occlusive [d] is statistically disfavored for

Table 4. Variable rule analysis of the probabilities of co-occurrence of occlusive realizations of intervocalic /d/ and usage and attitudinal factors in the Spanish of Rivera

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% [d]</th>
<th>Factor weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 2542) ≤ 40%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% — 80%</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward local Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input = 0.147  Log likelihood = −1161.344  p < .05  N = 2786 (except where indicated)

Other factor group included in analysis: Attitudes toward language mixing.
consultants who speak Spanish 80% of the time or more (with a factor weight of .43). As a result of speaking primarily Spanish, these consultants do not utilize this phonological variant often, if at all. Conversely, this articulation is used frequently by those who speak Portuguese often and is likely borrowed from this language into their Spanish.

Though, as mentioned previously, all consultants have a high level of familiarity with Portuguese, few actually prefer to speak this language (N = 19). Of course, for those who do prefer Portuguese to Spanish, the use of occlusive articulations for intervocalic /d/ is only natural. Results from the multivariate analysis confirm this prediction. It is statistically probable that consultants who prefer to speak Portuguese will realize intervocalic /d/ in accordance with the phonological standards of this language often, even when speaking Spanish (shown by a factor weight of .60). These findings strongly support the theory that the use of language-specific phonological variants is conditioned by preference and overall frequencies of language use.

The use of occlusive variants is not merely a cognitive/physiological process, however. It is also a social phenomenon, which Table 4 clearly demonstrates. Positive attitudes toward local Portuguese are almost as influential as the infrequent use of Spanish on the realization of intervocalic /d/ as a voiced dental occlusive (with a range of 33). Consultants with positive attitudes toward local Portuguese demonstrate statistically significant probabilities of occlusive use (with a factor weight of .55) whereas those who view this language negatively are unlikely to produce this loan articulation (with a factor weight of only .22). The fact that the use of occlusive articulations of intervocalic /d/ is statistically disfavored for these speakers indicates that they are choosing not to be identified with Brazil or Portuguese, at least linguistically, and see these influences as non-Uruguayan. This is not altogether surprising given the socio-historical background of this area and constant attempts by the national government to uphold monolingual standards, yet the majority of consultants do not feel negatively toward local Portuguese (N = 55). On the contrary, they identify with this country and language and embrace such influences as a way to preserve their heritage and familiar bonds.

Unlike the realization of intervocalic /d/ as an occlusive, the deletion of this phoneme is characteristic of non-border urban varieties of colloquial Spanish (Lipski 1994: 341). It is expected, then, that the deletion of /d/ in this linguistic context will correlate with the frequent use of Spanish, a preference for this language and negative attitudes toward border Portuguese as well as language mixing. The statistical significance and ranking of these factors were ascertained using a second multivariate analysis in which the application value was phonetic zero. The results from this analysis appear below in Table 5.
Surprisingly, neither Spanish use nor attitudes toward local varieties of Portuguese were determined to be statistically significant in the deletion of intervocalic /d/. The two factors that are significant in this process are attitudes toward language mixing and language preference. As expected, it is statistically probable (with a factor weight of .53) that consultants who prefer to speak Spanish will realize intervocalic /d/ as a phonetic zero. Since this phenomenon is not characteristic of Brazilian Portuguese, it is only natural that the deletion of this consonant is disfavored for consultants who prefer to use this language (with factor weight = .43).

The statistical likelihood that consultants displaying positive attitudes toward language mixing will delete intervocalic /d/ is somewhat counterintuitive, though, since this process is only characteristic of Spanish. If we consider the broader implications of the acceptance of language mixing, however, the contribution of this factor may be better explained. In general, speakers who view language mixing positively are much more accepting of non-standard articulations. Like the use of occlusive articulations of intervocalic /d/ in border varieties of Spanish, the deletion of this consonant, though characteristic of colloquial Spanish, also lacks linguistic prestige. Therefore, it can reasonably be concluded that less linguistically conservative speakers will use non-standard phonetic zero.

Of all speakers interviewed for the current study, it seems that the least linguistically conservative social groups would be students and members of non-professional occupations. It could be that these speakers have overwhelmingly positive attitudes toward language mixing. In order to explore this claim, a cross-tabulation of speaker occupation and attitudes toward language mixing was conducted. The results from this tabulation are shown below in Table 6.

Table 5. Variable rule analysis of the probabilities of co-occurrence of the deletion of intervocalic /d/ and usage and attitudinal factors in the Spanish of Rivera

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% [Ø]</th>
<th>Factor weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward language mixing</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 2630)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input = 0.060  Log likelihood = −624.391  
\( p < .05 \)  N = 2786 (except where indicated)

Other factor groups included in analysis:  
(1) Spanish use  
(2) Attitudes toward local varieties of Portuguese
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The group showing the greatest overall percentage of positive attitudes towards language mixing is students (66.7%), followed by non-professionals (45%). Only students, however, show a higher percentage of positive attitudes toward language mixing overall (at 66.7%) than negative attitudes (only 33.3%), which is not the case with even non-professionals (of whom 55% view language mixing negatively). In Waltermire (2008), multivariate analysis shows that the only social group for whom the deletion of intervocalic /d/ is statistically likely is the first generation. Though students comprise the majority of this generation, as discussed earlier, several first generation speakers have professional and non-professional jobs. When this generation is considered in its totality, the results are slightly different. Out of a total of 18 speakers of the first generation, 10 have positive attitudes toward language mixing (55.6%) while eight have negative attitudes toward this aspect of border life (44.4%). Therefore, it is not the youngest generation that is the least conservative linguistically, but students. These members of the community are leading the way for phonological change in the Spanish of Rivera.

8. Conclusion

The use of language-specific phonological variants in the Spanish of Rivera is conditioned by multiple social, usage and attitudinal factors. Consultants who use Portuguese more frequently than Spanish and have positive attitudes toward border Portuguese tend to incorporate loan articulations from Portuguese into their Spanish. These speakers identify with Brazil and use occlusive articulations of intervocalic /d/ as a way to align themselves more closely with Portuguese-influenced border varieties of Spanish. Bilinguals who prefer Spanish and have positive attitudes toward language mixing, on the other hand, tend to delete intervocalic /d/. Even though the deletion of intervocalic /d/ is socially stigmatized in non-border varieties of Uruguayan Spanish, by deleting this consonant, speakers are able to avoid linguistic associations with Portuguese. In this way, the deletion of intervocalic /d/ seems to be a covert prestige marker within Rivera for those

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>10/27</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>17/27</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional</td>
<td>9/20</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 599

Table 6. Cross-tabulation of speaker occupation and attitudes toward language mixing
speakers who do not wish to identify culturally, socially or ethnically with Brazil. In either case, the use of these language-specific articulations of intervocalic /d/ seems to be a salient marker of social and ethnic identity for bilinguals living in Rivera. Finally, given the considerable influence of Portuguese (which is most consultants’ L2) on the Spanish of Rivera, it can be concluded that L2 → L1 influence does occur, given appropriate social circumstances. Though the influence from L1 patterns on L2 is undoubtedly more pervasive in bilingual speech in general, the more subtle, sporadic nature of L2 → L1 influence merits further analysis. Future research in this area will deepen our understanding of how languages in contact interact with one another in complex ways.

Notes

1. Though varieties of bilingual Spanish of the Uruguayan-Brazilian border have not been examined extensively, there have been some partial treatments of these dialects. Carvalho (2006) examines the aspiration of syllable-final /s/ as a prestige marker in the community. Thun and Elizaincín (2000a) have documented the social distribution of sibilant fricative variants of /ʃ/ (referred to as žeismo and šeismo in Latin American dialectology) in border communities in their linguistic atlas of Uruguay. Elizaincín (2008) provides a thorough discussion of the rural Spanish of Northeastern Uruguay, which has been greatly influenced by Portuguese. In the urban Spanish of Rivera, there is also a competing influence stemming from the entry of prestige variants from Montevideo into the community. As Carvalho (2006) shows, the aspiration of syllable-final /s/ has become increasingly frequent and is being utilized in the community as a prestige marker. Not surprisingly, Elizaincín (2008) explains that /s/ aspiration is not common in rural varieties of border Spanish.

2. This information was not available for the city of Rivera at the time of data collection.

3. According to 2003 census reports, approximately 52% of Uruguayans are women.

4. As acquiring a professional occupation is rare at the age of 25 or younger in Rivera, especially after the financial crisis in the early part of the decade, fewer professionals from this generation were chosen than non-professionals.

5. Locating third generation female non-professionals proved to be impossible due to the fact that many women of this generation had never worked outside of the home.

6. Few consultants displayed negative feelings toward unmixed varieties of standard Portuguese. For this reason, it was decided that their attitudes toward local varieties of Portuguese would be analyzed. This factor demonstrates how closely a speaker aligns him or herself with local Brazilian culture and heritage, which may be reflected in his or her choice of language-specific phonological variants.

7. Only four speakers (C3, C20, C21 and C52) did not address language mixing at any time during an interview session. For this factor, these speakers were excluded from the multivariate analysis.

All rights reserved
8. Though the majority of consultants with negative attitudes toward border Portuguese also view language mixing negatively, several speakers view mixing as a natural part of life on the border.

9. The total number of consultants used in this tabulation is only 59 since several speakers did not reveal any information about their attitudes toward language mixing through direct commentary either during or outside of an interview session.
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Appendix: Post interview questionnaire

Nombre: _________________________________ Edad: _________

Profesión: ________________________________

Nacionalidad: _____________________________

Nacionalidad de padre: ____________________

Nacionalidad de madre: ____________________

Frecuencia con que usa el español:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En casa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el trabajo/la escuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En la iglesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el banco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En el correo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En restaurantes/bares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con el marido/la mujer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los hijos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los padres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los parientes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con los amigos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con el jefe/los maestros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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