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DIFFUSION OF LEXICAL INNOVATIONS IN THE SPANISH OF CUBAN AMERICANS

Ricardo Otheguy and Ofelia García
City College of New York

PART I: LEXICAL INNOVATIONS IN U.S. SPANISH

Introduction

Although many studies of Spanish-English contact provide descriptions of lexical innovations in several varieties of Spanish spoken in the United States (see for example Bills 1979, Lantolf 1983, Bobin 1982), only a few offer a quantitative analysis of the diffusion of these innovations. Among studies that do set out to measure diffusion, there are not many that distinguish in their calculations between different types of lexical contact phenomena, or that build speaker judgments into the definition of diffusion. One of the most thorough studies of lexical transfer from English into US Spanish (Poplack & Sankoff 1984) focused primarily on correlations between levels of integration into the recipient language and degrees of phonological and morphological adaptation; and it dealt exclusively with loanwords, without attempting to compare their level of penetration with that of other kinds of lexical innovations. (Until the need for further differentiation arises, we use the term US Spanish to refer globally to all contact varieties of Spanish spoken in the United States, even though we are quite aware that the term covers forms of speech that are very different from each other; we contrast it with the term “traditional Spanish,” which we use to refer to non-contact dialects spoken in Spain and Latin America.)

An area where investigation is particularly needed is the effect that the lexical structure of the imported items themselves has on their diffusion. We do not have enough theoretical discussion of how the typologies we offer for lexical innovations shape our understanding of contact phenomena in general, or of how these classifications can help or hinder our understanding of specific differences in diffusion rates among the items being classified. We know, for instance, that many US Hispanics are likely to say el building where Hispanics in the home country say el edificio; that they often say aplicación where their conlangs back home are more likely to say solicitud; that in describing a candidate for governor they speak of a candidate que quiere ser gobernador whereas speakers of traditional Spanish would almost certainly say que se postula para gobernador; that to suggest that the last thing they need is a cold they are heard to say que lo último que necesita es un catarro whereas in traditional Spanish one would probably say que lo único que se falta es un catarro. But we do not know whether these types of expressions are common or unusual, nor do we know whether these are all equally diffused or some types more than others. Nor do we know the impact that grouping lexical innovations in the way suggested by our examples — as opposed to in terms of some other typology — can have on the way we come to understand their diffusion.
Within any speech community under study, some groups of speakers are likely to use these types of expressions more than others. These different levels of diffusion, one supposes, have something to do with population characteristics such as levels of proficiency in the two languages, length of residence in the US, general level of education, and socioeconomic status. But profiles of this sort on the users of lexical innovations in US Spanish are also in short supply, and we lack information distinguishing the kinds of people among whom the innovations attain high diffusion from those among whom they attain low diffusion. (For an important treatment of this problem with regard to Canadian French, see Poplack, Sankoff, & Miller 1987.)

The present study presents the results of empirical research into these questions. Our data are derived from answers to a questionnaire, supplemented by face-to-face interviews, and are based on a new typology of lexical innovations, as well as on a new proposal as to the motivation for their emergence in contact dialects. An important limitation of our work is that, as in all questionnaire studies, we base our findings on self-reported, not actual, behavior.

Because neither Haugen (1950) nor Weinreich (1953), nor any of their followers, succeeded in establishing a widely accepted terminology for lexical innovations -- which reflects their lack of success in establishing a revealing taxonomy -- we try our hand at our own terms for our own typology. As most researchers before and after them, both Haugen and Weinreich distinguished loanwords from all other types of contact phenomena, Weinreich making a clear distinction between transferring and modeling. As the terms suggest, transferring involves the importation of elements from the source language, whereas modeling consists of using native materials in the reproduction of patterns from the model language. Weinreich distinguished between modeling in simple and compound words, referring to the former as semantic extensions and to the latter as loan translations. Haugen (1978:38) opted for a single term for all instances of modeling, calling them all loanshifts. As we discuss more fully elsewhere (Oteguy 1988), these taxonomies have not proven to be clear enough for use as the basis for the generation of empirical hypotheses. In particular, Weinreich's distinction between semantic extensions and loan translations has turned out to be problematic, as has the category of loan translation as a whole. The lack of clarity as to what exactly are loan translations, and as to what to call them, has led to multiple definitions and to uncertainty as to what phenomena should or should not be included under this category of modeling. (See, for instance Craddock 1981 and Benzil 1981 for two rather different interpretations.) We divide lexical innovations into two extensions and loan translations. We subdivide calques and phrasal calques into word calques and phonologically independent word calques, yielding altogether four types of lexical innovations, as diagrammed in Figure 1.
Figure 1
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We will see that this typology will allow us to not only describe which types of innovations are more, and which less, diffused, but also to attempt an explanation of these differences. In addition, our study establishes correlations between types of speakers and levels of diffusion of different lexical innovations, and proposes an explanation for these correlations. Our findings on US Spanish are important both because of what they add to our empirical knowledge of the characteristics of contact varieties and because of what they contribute to our theoretical understanding of such varieties. We summarize these contributions here, to be developed further below.

Among our most important factual findings are:

(A) Contrary to what might be expected, there is greater diffusion of lexical innovations among those members of the community that do not know the language of origin of the innovations than among those that do. The Spanish of monolingual bilingual Hispanics in our sample shows more lexical influence from English than that of bilingual Hispanics.

(B) In keeping with this, monolinguals seem to be much less aware than bilinguals of the existence of English-based lexical innovations in their speech.

(C) Structural differences between types of lexical innovations have a determining effect on the level of diffusion attained by each among bilinguals, but less so among monolinguals.
(D) Speakers of minority languages report that they use many lexical innovations that they themselves regard as unacceptable, their usage being guided by what appears to be a self-conscious resignation to "speaking incorrectly" in order to be able to use the language in an alien environment.

Among our most important theoretical findings are:

(E) In order to have explanatory value, a typology of lexical innovation must allow us to distinguish explicitly, and to manipulate separately, the outer form and the inner content of lexical material. We find that the most useful formulation in this respect is the familiar Saussurean distinction between the signifier, or signal, and the signified, or meaning, of a linguistic "sign."

(F) An explicit formulation in terms of signals and meanings allows us to recognize that many apparent cases of lexical innovation are just cases of cultural, not linguistic, novelty; and to explain that, for this reason, because they do not change the semantic system of the recipient language, they attain the widest level of diffusion of all innovations.

(G) Likewise, an explicit formulation in terms of signals and meanings allows us to explain the apparently puzzling phenomenon of the greater diffusion that lexical innovations attain among those members of the community that do not know the source language.

(H) The preservation of the integrity of the linguistic sign is central to an explanation of the different levels of diffusion attained by different types of lexical innovations among bilinguals. That is, phonological and semantic elements do not weigh separately as factors that facilitate or hinder the penetration of these innovations among people who know both the source and the recipient languages.

(I) The willingness of monolinguals to regard English signals independently of their meanings appears to explain why their Spanish — contrary to what happens with the Spanish of bilinguals — shows essentially the same level of diffusion for all types of lexical innovations.

Sample Population

The present study was conducted among Cuban Americans in Dade County, Florida. Dade County is one of the few places in the United States where
Spanish plays a public role that goes beyond the boundaries of the ethnic community. Spanish is a thriving and evolving language used throughout Dade County by many Hispanics of many different national origins for many types of activities that transcend the familiar domains of home, church, and neighborhood. The widespread use of Spanish in business, education, and the media, although remaining a subject of controversy, is nevertheless a fact. It is not unusual, for instance, to find large schools and businesses where most interaction between members of the staff, and between them and the public, is in Spanish (Garcia & Otheguy 1985). Spanish in Dade County, then, enjoys more prestige and is associated with a more powerful and influential minority, and one that represents a much larger proportion of the total population, than is the case with Spanish in most other Hispanic communities of the US. At the same time, the most cursory examination of the dialects shows that English contact phenomena abound. We thought it useful, then, to select a speech community where Spanish was heavily influenced by English but, at the same time, was used widely beyond the ethnic enclaves and held in high regard by its users.

In order to keep these two conditions constant, namely high use and high status, we conducted our survey in a large Cuban-owned business where we noticed that practically all transactions, except those over long-distance telephone with out-of-town suppliers, are in Spanish. A large Cuban lumberyard, employing hundreds of Cubans as well as Hispanics of other nationalities, was selected. The survey was conducted in the summer of 1983 and was limited -- in order to keep reasonably low the confounding effect of different native dialects -- to those Hispanics among managers and employees who were of Cuban origin.

It follows that even though we shall continue to speak of "US Spanish," what we are really providing an analysis of is the Spanish spoken by Cubans in Miami, and of a small sample of them at that. We insist on the use of an overly ambitious term "US Spanish" because our informal, although careful and highly informed, observation is that the similarities between the variety spoken by our informants and those spoken in other US Hispanic communities, particularly on the East Coast, are far greater than the differences. Furthermore, we find it useful to present our findings, once these limitations are disclosed, in the most general terms possible so as to submit them to the greatest replication and testability.

We distributed 100 questionnaires, of which 74 were returned to us. All respondents were of Cuban background: 88 percent born in Cuba and 12 percent in the United States, with 77 percent having lived in the United States over 10 years. With regard to education, most respondents (74 percent) had finished high school. They were roughly evenly divided between men (53 percent) and women (47 percent), and between young adults (54 percent were under thirty years of age) and mature adults (46 percent were over thirty).

On a self-report on language use and proficiency most respondents (77 percent) said they "spoke English well," although practically all of them (99 percent) said that they spoke Spanish "always or almost always" at home, and most
of them (77 percent) said they spoke Spanish "always or almost always" at work. Practically all respondents (96 percent) thought that it was "very important" for them to speak and maintain Spanish alive in the US, and almost the same proportion (95 percent) said that it was very important for their children to do so. Likewise, they were practically all (96 percent) in agreement on the importance of knowing English and "being bilingual."

The Questionnaire.

The main part of our questionnaire, which appears in its entirety in Appendix A, consisted of 40 sentences in which either a word or phrase had been underlined. We asked respondents questions in order to elicit information regarding three variables, which were adopted from Cooper (1979), and around which we will frame our discussion:

- Awareness of the innovation
- Adoption of the innovation
- Acceptability of the innovation

In addition, our discussion will center on a fourth variable about which respondents were not asked any direct questions, but which we derive statistically as an average of the first three:

- Diffusion of the innovation

The reason we think of diffusion as a composite variable derived from awareness, adoption, and acceptability is that awareness and adoption alone do not reflect what we generally understand by diffusion, that is, the degree to which the innovation is a somewhat permanent feature of the language. Awareness and adoption without an accompanying positive value judgment on the part of the community still leaves the innovation in a precarious state; it may be widespread today, but it will not become incorporated into the language. Only when an innovation is both widely spread and widely accepted can we speak of its having attained wide diffusion. (For an interesting approach to the question of degree of diffusion, one also derived from questions put to informants, but based on a different form of elicitation and conceived of as degree of integration, see Poplack & Sankoff 1984.)

Our questionnaire was all in Spanish. The phrasing we actually used with our informants did not include words like awareness, adoption, and acceptability; rather, we simply asked, for each sentence, whether respondents had "heard it," whether they "used it," and whether they thought it was "correct." Our discussion here, however, does make reference to the four variables by their more technical names.
The Genesis of Lexical Innovations.

We start by raising the question of why lexical innovations exist in contact varieties in the first place, because we believe that it is only by developing an explicit, even if tentative, answer to this question that we can provide a theoretical basis on which to construct a proper understanding of this phenomenon.

We assume here -- on the basis of suggestions first made by Haugen (1938) -- that lexical innovations are essentially a response to two conflicting aims, or needs, of language minority populations. (We use the term language minority advisedly, in hopes of encompassing under it not only communities made up mostly of immigrants from distant lands, such as the Eastern Europeans who migrated to the United States at the turn of the century, but also communities, such as US Hispanics, that contain large numbers of people born within the political boundaries of the United States, and whose immigrants have come mostly from close-by states.)

These two conflicting aims or needs of language minority populations are: (1) to speak in the minority or ancestral language, (2) to communicate ideas, notions, and messages, that are common in the majority culture, and therefore commonly expressed in the majority language, but that are rare or absent in the minority culture, and therefore rarely expressed in the minority language. These message types that are seldom or never expressed in the minority language turn out in many cases not to be even expressible in this language unless it is subjected to some alteration, hence the innovation.

The idea that the message types of one culture are different from those of another is a natural extension of the position, familiar in linguistics, that the meanings of words in one language are not equivalent to those in another, since different languages lexicalize different portions of the same semantic fields and, in many cases, different semantic fields altogether (Culler 1977). This nonequivalence of messages between cultures, which has long been widely recognized in theories of translation (Catford 1965), is discussed in greater detail in O'Keefe (1982, 1983).

In the present study, our interest lies with those notions or messages that are, or are perceived by the US Hispanic community to be, unique to Anglo-American society. These message types are readily expressible in English, but are seldom or never expressed in the societies of Latin America or Spain, and are therefore not readily expressible in traditional Spanish. Speakers of Spanish in the US find themselves heir to a language that they very much want, or have, to speak, but that is not equipped to handle the full range of message types of US society.

As a result, US Hispanics begin to introduce what appear to be -- but, as we shall see, only in some cases in fact are -- changes into their Spanish, changes designed to allow it to convey the messages of US society that they need.
or want to convey as they increase contact with the majority culture. The only other alternative, and one that is obviously not available to the considerable proportion of the minority community that is monolingual in Spanish, would be to speak in English.

It is in fact this message, or message element, this notion or idea that belongs to the majority, but not to the minority, community that we notice as contact phenomena. Our attention is drawn not to an unusual lexical item or construction, but to an idea that we recognize as familiar in English but unusual for Spanish. We take notice of something that we had never heard said before in Spanish, and that strikes us as typically Anglo-American. What we notice is not so much that something is not part of traditional Spanish but that it is not part of traditional Spanish-speaking communities; we notice not so much a lexical innovation as a communicative innovation; we are struck not by a linguistic novelty but by a cultural one.

In summary, we will argue here that the diffusion of lexical innovations is best understood if we take as their genesis the need for a minority community to communicate new messages not readily communicable in their traditional language in an unaltered form, and if we assume, further, that what we perceive at the level of simple observation is this new message partial.

We will see that in some cases this cultural innovation then forces the speaker of a minority language into truly linguistic, systemic innovations, but that much of it is fitted into what may seem to be innovations but are in fact traditional uses of Spanish. We will show that by understanding contact phenomena in these terms we can explain degrees of diffusion in ways that would be difficult if different approaches were taken.

We need to stress at this point that the novelty of a message with respect to the traditional language is not always a matter of objective reality but of the perception of the members of the minority community. This point is made, although in somewhat different terms, in Haugen's (1938) discussion of lexical innovation in US Norwegian; but it may not have been sufficiently appreciated in the discussion of the lack of objective need that French Canadians have for the items they borrow from English (Poplack, Sankoff, and Miller 1987:14). Haugen showed that the perception of novelty applied not only to the more complex area of abstract notions but also to the relatively straightforward field of physical objects.

Displaced populations such as Haugen's Norwegians, or our Dade County Cubans, are faced with a new society that deals in the new language with new concepts and also new objects. But the immigrants may perceive novelty where an observer familiar with both societies would find that identical ideas and objects existed back home. When speaking Norwegian, Haugen's subjects considered rivers, basements, schools, and all sorts of objects and institutions in the United States as new and merits English loanwords, even though it was plain for all to see that these objects and institutions existed as well in the
society they had left behind in Norway and were lexicalized in Norwegian. It
mattered little to them that Norwegian had a perfectly usable word elv to mean a
river; in US Norwegian they used the English loanword river. When pressed, they
said they used the English word because such things as "rivers" did not exist in
Norway. When confronted with the patent falsity of his statement -- and with
the word elv -- they explained that elv were the rivers of Scandinavia; those in
the US were rivers, not elv.

At this point, Haugen pressed his informants further, asking them to think
through this apparently false sense of novelty with regard to such things as
rivers. Some conjectured that perhaps their perception was due to the fact that
the Scandinavian elv rolled and roared whereas the rivers of their American
experience were the meandering bodies of water of the Midwest, being thus two
different things. But even highly subjective explanations of this kind are
rare. Often the mere fact of something being in the US makes it different.
Norwegian laere did not feel right for what went on in American schools, so the
English word teach was used by Haugen's informants.

The problem of novelty being in the mind of the speaker of the contact
dialect is compounded by the fact that students of contact phenomena --
researchers, professors, and investigators of all kinds -- often speak a form of
the minority language that is very different from that spoken by most members of
that minority. The reason most members of a minority community confront so many
new message types as they penetrate the majority society is that their
experience in the old country, or in the minority enclave in the US, was very
different from the Anglo-American experience. For their more educated
compatriots, the ones who usually do research -- whose experience with the tradi-
tional forms of the language may have been more urban, more technical, and more
bureaucratic -- majority society in the United States presents less novelty and
their traditional language is therefore less in need of innovations. Quite
simply, the traditional language has different varieties for different speakers,
and the lexical repertoire of some of those varieties is nearer to majority
English than that of other varieties. But it is the lexical repertoire of une-
ducated immigrants and minority members that we must understand if we are to
make sense of contact phenomena. In the case of Norwegian Americans, we could
speculate, for instance, that even though the analyst may have known, say, the
Norwegian word laere, an immigrant who may never have gone to school in rural
Norway might not have had much use for the word, and may have found in English
teach a -- to him -- genuinely new idea. As US Hispanics come into greater con-
tact with Anglo-American society, either as immigrants or as increasingly incor-
porated US-born members of the minority, they are confronted, like the
Norwegians, with a world filled with new objects and notions, all of which
strike them as not being expressible in the language they know, and therefore
all meriting new words and expressions. This remains true even if in many
instances it may seem to an outside observer that these notions and objects are
not new, and that the words and expressions of traditional Spanish ought to suf-
fice.
Consider, for example, the apparently puzzling currency of el building in US Spanish, where traditional Spanish el edificio would seem to do as well. The puzzle dissipates once we remember that many US Hispanics are of rural origins and are not likely to have seen buildings on a daily basis until they come to the cities of the United States, and therefore likely not to have used the word edificio. Or, alternatively, they knew and used edificio quite readily back home, but like the elves of Norway, their edificios did not quite match the new American reality. In either case, the Hispanic in the US is presented with a notion, in this case a physical structure, that is somehow new, or felt to be new, and that as such requires a new means of expression. If our aim is to understand why el building appears to have caught on, it matters little that more educated US Hispanics are perfectly familiar with edificio. Likewise, if our aim is to understand why el boiler, el steam, and el heater seem to have caught on, it matters little that educated US Hispanics are perfectly familiar with la caldera and la calefacción. In the mountains of the islands of the Caribbean there are no buildings fitted with steam heat or oil-burning boilers.

A Typology of Lexical Innovations.

This expression of Anglo-American notions in Spanish is accomplished by importing whole, or in part, different English lexical items, that is, all or part of different English "signs," taking the term in the familiar sense of Saussure (1916). As is well known, in Saussure's theoretical formulation the sign is a fusion of two parts: (1) a signifier or unit of expression and (2) a signified or unit of content. To conform to the more familiar English terminology, we will refer to the signifier and the signified as the signal and the meaning, respectively. It is these two parts of the linguistic sign its signal and its meaning, whose manipulation by speakers of US Spanish we discuss.

We classify the lexical innovations outlined in Figure 1 by making explicit reference to whether what is imported from English or altered in Spanish is both a signal with its meaning, or one of the two alone, or, as we shall see is sometimes the case, neither of the two. We shall see that this conceptualization of the contact mechanism is the most revealing of the extent and causes of diffusion of lexical innovations.

(A) Loanwords

Se consiguió un puesto de super en un building.
He got a job as super in a building.

Necesito hacer un part-time para ganar dinero.
I've got to work part-time to make money.

Tengo que ir al dealer a pagar el automóvil.
I've got to go to the dealer to pay for the car.

We use the term loanword in the generally accepted sense of a sign that is imported whole from a source language, with greater or lesser phonological adap-
tation to the recipient language. In Saussurean terms, what is imported in loanwords in our case is an English signal together with an English meaning. We must stress, however, that we see the loanword as being motivated by the feeling in the speaker that none of the traditional words of Spanish -- at least those he knows -- quite express the American message, for which he finds it handy to import English words. This, we repeat, is our conception of the common denominator of all lexical innovations in US Spanish.

(B) Phonologically merged word calques

El martes me registré en la universidad.
I registered at the university on Tuesday.

Hay que llenar una forma para abrir la cuenta.
You have to fill out a form to open an account.

We use the term calque in the familiar sense that suggests that the element in question has all along belonged to the recipient language, but is being used in a manner that calques the usage of the lending language. In our example, registrar is an element that exists in Spanish in its own right, but that would not be used in traditional Spanish for the act of signing up at an educational institution. The word is Spanish, but it is being used with one of the senses of English register, not with any of the traditional senses of registrar. To speak of registrarse en la universidad, then, is to calque the English usage.

In word calques, as in loanwords, we note the presence of a message, or message element, that the speakers feel as being too different from the messages back home to be expressed by means of unaltered elements from traditional Spanish. The word solicitud, for example, may be the traditional Spanish word for a paper that one fills out to request a job, but what one does in US cities is to fill out an aplicación, either because one never did such things in one's simpler, less bureaucratic life in the home area, or because the activity feels too different from the activity back home to warrant the same word. The piece of paper there may be a solicitud, but here it doesn't feel like a solicitud; it feels like an aplicación.

We distinguish between calques involving single words from those involving several words by the straightforward terminological distinction of word calque versus phrasal calque. We have chosen the term calque precisely because it will allow us to highlight, with categories that are terminologically manageable, both the similarities and the differences between word and phrasal calques (that roughly, equivalent to Weinreich's semantic extensions and loan transfers, respectively; and also equivalent, if taken both together, to Banger's loanshifts).

Within the word calques we distinguish those that are phonologically merged from those that are phonologically independent. We use the term phonologically merged calque for cases such as registrar where the Spanish item and its English
model are similar not only in meaning but also in pronunciation, as we see the matter, the lexical innovation is based on an equation established between registrar and register that rests on similarities in the meaning but also on similarities in the signal. We choose the term merged to suggest that the signal of the English model has merged with that of the Spanish word into which one of its senses has migrated; that is, the pronunciation of register has merged with that of registrar. We shall see that this quality of merged signals is useful in explaining several facts about the different degrees of diffusion that this type of innovation attains in different strata of our sample.

With regard to their meanings, there is a reasonable analysis that would show registrar and register having some senses that are shared and some that are not. Both registrar and register have the sense of inscription or formal entry onto the records of municipal and other official corporations, although in traditional Spanish registrar lacks the sense of entry into an educational institution, that sense being reserved for matricular. The calquing, then, appears to be based on an extension or adjustment performed by the speaker of the contact dialect, increasing the similarity between the meanings of the two words (cf. Weinreich 1953:48). The word registrar is more similar to register in US Spanish than in traditional Spanish, a new shared sense, that of entry into a school or college, having been added to those it already had.

(C) Phonologically independent word calques

Corrió para gobernador en las últimas elecciones.
He ran for governor in the last elections.

Quiero que camines al niño hasta la escuela.
I want you to walk the child to school.

Although both phonologically independent and phonologically merged word calques consist of Spanish words used in ways that calque the usage of an English model, they differ in that the pronunciation of the independent word calque does not resemble that of the English item. The term “independent” is intended to suggest that the similarities in meaning that have been established between the calque and the model are operating independently of the sort of phonological similarities that we find in merged word calques.

We find here again the motif of a new message that feels too American to be conveyed by the familiar linguistic tools of the unaltered traditional language. Elections and the running for office are not necessarily part of the stock of experiences that US Hispanics have brought from their home areas in or out of the United States. But even if they are, we speculate that to run for political office in the United States urban setting feels different from anything that one did back home — even if one witnessed or was involved in many elections in the home area — or from anything that can be expressed with unchanged traditional Spanish elements, thus prompting the start of the calquing process.
Since independent word calques do not have any phonological similarity with their English model, it is safe to assume that the connection between them is being established only on semantic grounds. That is, the process that leads to merged word calques seems to feed on similarities involving both signals and meanings. The process that leads to independent word calques is one that operates only on meanings. As was the case with registrar, the verb correr exists in traditional Spanish, although not with the sense of running for public office. In our example, correr is considered a calque because it is being used with one of the senses of run, not with any of the traditional senses of correr, just as registrar and register had some shared senses and some unshared ones, correr and run share the sense of moving rapidly, as in a race, but not the sense of aspiring to public office. The word correr is now more similar to run in US Spanish than in traditional Spanish, a common sense, that of running for public office, having been added to those it already had. (For ease of reading, we will occasionally drop either or both of the words "phonologically" and "word" from our references to phonologically independent word calques and phonologically merged word calques, referring to them sometimes as just merged calques and independent calques, or simply, if we speak of them together, as word calques. But the reader should remember, as Figure 1 indicates, that they are both distinguished from phrasal calques in involving only one lexical item.)

(D) Phrasal calques

Pregúntale si sabe cómo hacerlo.
Ask him if he knows how to do it.

Con todos los problemas que tengo, lo último que necesito
es un catarrho.
With all the problems I have, the last thing I need is a cold.

Phrasal calques resemble word calques in that elements that belong to the borrowing language in their own right are being used in the manner of the lending language. But here one cannot detect any alteration in any Spanish signs. All signals and all meanings in phrasal calques are from traditional Spanish. Why are these calques then? Why do they feel like lexical innovations?

We argue that when we come to phrasal calques we are at the point where all that remains from English is the message. These expressions feel like innovations because they are, as were word calques, expressions of ideas or notions that strike speakers of Spanish as foreign and as having a clear American model. But in fact they are being communicated with unaltered material from traditional Spanish. They feel like innovations because we notice the cultural novelty, not the linguistic one.

The innovation in lo último que necesito is calqued on the English the last thing I need, but it has been conveyed without in any way altering the meaning
of Spanish words. In this sense, phrasal calques are not linguistic innovations at all; they are simply manifestations of the familiar process by which a language uses its finite means in order to express an infinite number of new ideas. In phrasal calques these new ideas come from English, but they are expressed without anglicizing any Spanish elements. Our position, then, is that this form of acculturation exists in all four types of innovations, it being in all four the factor that triggers our attention. But whereas in the first three the acculturation phenomenon has consequences in the linguistic system itself — it brings in new signals and new meanings; it changes meanings, etc. -- in the case of phrasal calques it leaves the linguistic system untouched. In all four cases we notice something new from the point of view of traditional Spanish, but only in the first three is that something linguistic in nature; in the last it is purely cultural (for further discussion and a critique on similar grounds of the notion of loan translation, see Oteguy 1988.)

**Predictions**

Based on our typology of lexical innovations, one can make predictions in terms of the factors that ought to affect the four variables under study, namely, awareness, adoption, acceptability, and diffusion of innovations. We assume that the operative explanatory factors here are (A) the degree of visibility of the innovation, that is, how easy it is for the speakers of the contact dialect to notice it and (B) the degree of systemic deviance of the innovation, that is, how much it departs from the traditional Spanish language system.

(A) Visibility is assumed to be greater in signals than in meanings. We find that most people in their dealings with language tend to notice matters of pronunciation — accents, intonation, slips — more than matters of meaning. So we find it safe to assume that visibility is highest in loanwords whose signals give them away as English elements. We also think that visibility is least in the phrasal calques, which have neither meanings nor signals from English.

We assume further, although with considerable less certainty, that independent word calques are more visible than merged word calques. This is so because the merged calque introduces the newly created sense — the innovation in the meaning — under cover of a familiar signal, familiar, that is, for the semantic field of the sense being introduced. In registrar, the new sense of "signing up at a college" should pass with less notice because of its similarity with the traditional senses already existing in registrar. In correr the new sense of "aspiring to public office" should stick out and become noticeable because it is totally unrelated to the traditional senses of correr. In other words, the innovation in registrar is less visible than that in correr because in registrar the new sense is masked by a signal that is used for similar senses, whereas in correr the new sense has come to inhabit a signal whose senses in traditional Spanish have nothing to do with the newly acquired one.

Our prediction regarding the variable of awareness for each type of innovation should dovetail with the visibility factor, the most visible innovations
showing the highest level of awareness, the least visible innovation showing the lowest, and so on in corresponding orders in between. Therefore, we predict that informants' responses for each of the four types of innovations with respect to the awareness variable will be from most to least: loanwords, merged word calques, independent word calques, phrasal calques.

(B) Systematic deviance is assumed, like visibility, to be greatest in the loanwords and least in the phrasal calques. We think of systematic deviance quantitatively in terms of signals and meanings. A loanword has two deviant elements from the point of view of the traditional Spanish system because it is made up of both imported signals and imported meanings. Word calques have one deviant element from the point of view of the traditional Spanish system because they are made up of imported meanings with traditional Spanish signals. Phrasal calques have no deviant elements at all because both their meanings and signals are from traditional Spanish.

Our predictions regarding both the variables of adoption and acceptability of the innovations should dovetail with what we consider to be the degree of deviance of the innovation, the least deviant one having the highest levels of adoption and acceptability, the most deviant one having the lowest level, and so on in corresponding order in between. Therefore, we predict that informants' responses for each of the four types of innovations with respect to the adoption and acceptability variables will be, from most to least: phrasal calques, independent word calques, merged word calques, loanwords.

PART II: RESULTS

Results from the Questionnaire

Table 1 shows results for the four types of innovations plus a category of dummy sentences. These dummies were normal sentences of traditional Spanish that were introduced into the questionnaire in order to provide us with a baseline of comparison. As mentioned earlier, we have also averaged the responses to the three individual categories and indicate these results as a measure of the diffusion of the innovation.

Based on the data displayed in Table 1, we offer in Table 2 an index of the percentage point difference between, on the one hand, the affirmative responses to the dummy sentences of traditional Spanish and, on the other, the affirmative responses to sentences containing the innovations themselves. That is, Table 2 responses to sentences containing the innovations themselves. That is, Table 2 shows how much each innovation deviated from the base-line constituted by the average of the answers given to ordinary sentences showing no evidence of contact.
TABLE 1

Percentage of respondents answering in the affirmative to questions regarding Awareness, Adoption, Acceptability, and Diffusion of four types of lexical innovations in the Spanish of Dade County, Florida.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I AWARENESS</th>
<th>II ADOPTION</th>
<th>III ACCEPTABILITY</th>
<th>IV DIFFUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hear it? %</td>
<td>Use it? %</td>
<td>Judged to be Correct? %</td>
<td>INDEX*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loanwords</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Word Calques</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Work Calques</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal Calques</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummies</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Awareness, adoption, and acceptability were actual variables in the questionnaires. All linguistic items in the questionnaires were classified according to our typology. In columns I, II, and III the figures are percentages who answered yes to hearing, using, and judging to be correct items of each type. The diffusion variable in column IV is a composite derived from the average of yes answers to the awareness, adoption, and acceptability variables. It does not reflect an actual variable in the questionnaires.

Table 2

Percentage point difference between the results obtained for each innovation and those obtained for the dummy sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I AWARENESS</th>
<th>II ADOPTION</th>
<th>III ACCEPTABILITY</th>
<th>IV DIFFUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hear it? +</td>
<td>Use it? -</td>
<td>Judged to be Correct? -</td>
<td>INDEX -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Word Calques</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Work Calques</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal Calques</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Awareness Variable

As shown in Table 1, Column I, there is great awareness of these innovations in the community, respondents claiming to hear them just as often as traditional usage. Over two-thirds of the people surveyed claimed to be aware of all four types of innovations, with loanwords being the most heard, followed by phonologically merged word calques, and closely followed by phrasal calques. As shown in Table 2, sentences containing one type of innovation, loanwords, actually show a higher level of awareness than the normal sentences that were used as dummies.

The high proportion of respondents who claimed to be aware of these lexical innovations confirms that our questionnaire contained linguistic features that are familiar and widespread in this community. In line with Poplack's discussion (1983), these are clearly not instances of interference in the sense of features that are "unpredictable, unintentional and deviant from community norms" (1983:119). Rather, it seems that the innovations we chose and, we assume, the types they represent, are very much part of the lexical repertoire of this variety of US Spanish.

Furthermore, the fact that loanwords are the innovation reportedly heard by the highest proportion of informants (87 percent) accords with our prediction that high visibility produces high awareness.

The Adoption Variable

In addition to wanting to know how aware the speakers of this dialect were of these lexical innovations, we wanted to know to what degree they had adopted them, that is, how much they reported to actually use them, as opposed to just hearing them used. Table 1, Column II, shows the results of our question regarding the adoption of the innovations. We found that with the exception of independent word calques, all the innovations seem to have been widely adopted by the speech community. Over 50 percent of the speakers we surveyed used the examples of loanwords and phrasal calques that we selected, and slightly less (46 percent) used our examples of phonologically merged word calques.

We had predicted that because of their lack of systemic deviance, phrasal calques would be the most widely adopted; and further, that because of their high systemic deviance loanwords would be the least used. We were surprised to find that this was not so. True, phrasal calques were used by a high proportion of respondents, as expected (54 percent) but loanwords were used by an even higher proportion (58 percent). In comparison, merged word calques were adopted by 46 percent and independent word calques by 28 percent.

We should take note of the fact that the high level of adoption of loanwords exists even in the face of considerable social disapproval. As we will see, loanwords are the most adopted but the least accepted of lexical innovations.
After loanwords, the second most adopted innovation is phrasal calques such as saber cómo hacerlo, hacer@[ac0] merto en la escuela, lo último que necesito, which we saw as not constituting any kind of deviation from the linguistic system. It turns out, then, that we were wrong in expecting an inverse correlation between systemic deviance and use. The two most used innovations are the most deviant one (loanwords) and the least deviant one (phrasal calques).

An Explanation of Findings on the Adoption Variable

We interviewed some of the respondents in order to supplement our findings, and to try to shed some light on the difference between our expectations and the results regarding level of adoption. It became evident to us that the reason deviance from the system of traditional Spanish is not the determining criteria for the adoption of an innovation is that the efficacy and authenticity of the communication is much more important, even if it forces the use of signals and meanings that are known to be English and whose use the speaker deplores.

We interpret both the findings from the questionnaires and the answers to our interviews in light of our assumption that the genesis of lexical innovations is the need to communicate, in Spanish, messages for which Spanish had not been previously used. We have learned that this need to, as it were, “speak English in Spanish” overrides all other considerations. There is no better or more direct way of communicating new meanings than to make a careful selection of the very words that English-speakers use to communicate them. Loanwords are incorporated into US Spanish so as to equip it to express the same notions that are communicated in English. Like Baugen’s US Norwegians, US Hispanics seem to feel that they somehow are not saying exactly what they want to say if Spanish words are used. Notions like part-time work, real estate salesman, and car dealers may be easily expressible, and certainly readily translatable, into Spanish. But it is exactly part-time work, real estate salesman, and car dealer that the speaker wants to say, and for that it is these words that must be used, even if, as shown by the disapproval, one is sorry to have to use them.

In addition to reinforcing our formulation of the genesis of lexical innovations, our findings on the types of innovations that are most widely adopted -- loanwords and phrasal calques -- lead us to a second conclusion.

We had thought that speakers would stay away from the accumulation of deviant elements and would therefore use loanwords much less than any kind of word calque. Our reasoning was that loans introduce two deviant elements -- a deviant signal with a deviant meaning -- while word calques introduce only one, the deviant meaning. But what we have learned is that speakers do not appear concerned about safeguarding the integrity of the existing system from an accumulation of deviant signals and meanings considered independently of each other. Rather, they are interested in safeguarding the integrity of individual signs, that is, they are interested in protecting the relationship between signals and meanings, irrespective of what system these signs come from. As long as these two elements stay together, as long, that is, as there is no mismatch of signals
from one sign and meanings from another, adoption is sure to take place if the communicative need arises. It is only when a mismatch occurs that there is great reluctance to adopt.

The innovations that were most widely adopted — loanwords and phrasal calques — seem at first very different in that one of them shows the highest number of deviant elements, whereas the other one shows none. But they are quite similar in that both contain perfectly matched sets of signals and meanings. What needed hacer un part-time para ganar dinero and los niños hacen mejor en las escuelas have in common is more important than what distinguishes them: they both consist of strings of intact signs, even though some of the signs on the first one are from English.

This is in sharp contrast with phonologically independent word calques like corrió para gobernador, where the innovation has created a mismatch between signal and meaning. Items like corrió para gobernador, which we thought was less deviant than items like trabajar part-time because they imported fewer English elements, turn out to be the least adopted innovation. We would argue that this is because corrió para gobernador violates the integrity of the sign, since it introduces the sense of aspiring to public office into a signal that normally has no senses remotely resembling it. It is this mismatch between signal and meaning that speakers shun.

Note that it could not be the presence of an English meaning that produces the very low level of adoption for phonologically independent word calques such as correr in correr para gobernador. Loanwords, after all, also introduce an English meaning and yet they are widely adopted. But they, we argue, introduce it with its own signal, thus insuring adoption.

Moreover — and perhaps most supportive for our explanation of the different levels of adoption in terms of the preservation of the integrity of the sign — the introduction of an English meaning does not preclude a high level of adoption for phonologically merged word calques such as el seres me registré en la universidad. But here the introduction of the new meaning is accompanied by the following two factors that insure the integrity of the sign and the resulting wide adoption.

First, in registrarse en la universidad, as in most merged word calques, there is an imported sense, but one that is related to the existing senses of traditional Spanish registrar. While signing up for a university is not one of the traditional senses of registrar it nevertheless resembles them greatly. There isn’t thus as much of a break between the signal registrar and its traditional meaning as there is in the case of correr when the sense of aspiring to public office is introduced.

Second, we would argue that in registrarse en la universidad, as in all phonologically merged word calques, the similarity in pronunciation between the calque and the English model creates a secondary bond between signal and meaning.
that preserves the integrity of the sign. The speaker of US Spanish who uses registrarse en la universidad is not using signals from one sign and meanings from another. The match between English register and its meaning is preserved because registrarse is, to some degree, not only the English meaning, but also the English signal, now overlaid on a Spanish one. Bilingual speakers are rarely conscious of any violation between signal and meaning in these merged calques. The similarity of signals between the Spanish and English signs creates the illusion that they are both the same sign. The speakers are merging the Spanish and the English signals and are not conscious of any mismatches the way they are in cases like correr para gobernador.

In short, the violation of the bond between signal and meaning remains the least accepted lexical innovation. Neither phonological factors nor semantic factors (that is, signal factors or meaning factors) weigh separately in the adoption of innovations. Thus, whether the signal is from English (as in loanwords) or from Spanish (as in a phrasal calque) is irrelevant. Speakers tend to use any communicative innovation that preserves the arbitrary relationship between signal and meaning, irrespective of its location in one language system or another.

**The Acceptability Variable**

As shown in Table 1, Column III, loanwords were regarded as correct by the lowest proportion of respondents, 16 percent. In comparison, independent word calques were found correct by 31 percent, merged word calques by 37 percent, and phrasal calques by 47 percent.

The results show that loanwords are the least acceptable innovation, even though they are the most used. They also show that the most acceptable innovations are the phrasal calque and the merged word calque. That is, there is a high degree of correspondence between adoption and acceptability with regard to phonologically merged word calques and phrasal calques; they both show high use and high approval. The break between use and approval is found only in the loanwords.

We have already explained this in terms of visibility, the loanwords being stigmatized because they are easily recognized as importations from English, whereas the phonologically merged word calques pass unnoticed because they have slipped into a familiar signal and, in addition, bring into Spanish a sense that is not completely dissimilar to the existing senses of the signal into which they migrate. We have also already noted that speakers do not base their decisions to adopt an innovation on their judgment that it is correct usage. Loan words are used, even though they are judged to be incorrect, because they are the most effective transmitters of the English message. In addition, loans do not violate the integrity of any signs. And they are, in fact, the only way to be completely true to the English message while speaking in Spanish. Speakers appear to be aware of these qualities of loans and are willing to adopt them even when they recognize them as not Spanish.
The Diffusion Variable

The extent to which the lexical innovation is diffused within a speech community is, in our view, a combination of the levels of awareness, adoption, and acceptability that the community shows toward the particular innovation. Our results regarding this composite variable (shown in Table 1, Column IV) indicate that phrasal calques are the most highly diffused innovation in this community, showing a diffusion index of .60, with loanwords and phonologically merged word calques following close behind with a .54 index. This finding is explained nicely by our delineation of cultural and linguistic innovations. Since phrasal calques represent a usage that adheres strictly to the Spanish system while expressing important, timely, and locally relevant messages, they obtain the highest levels of diffusion.

This result supports the suggestion we have made elsewhere (Otheguy 1982, 1983) that phrasal calques, much more so than loanwords, distinguish US Spanish from traditional Spanish. That is, this result adds weight to our contention that the sense of strangeness caused sometimes by US Spanish when heard by speakers of traditional Spanish stems mostly from what US Hispanics say, not from the use they make of Spanish to say it. That phrasal calques are the most distinctive characteristic of US Spanish has also been found to be the case in our study comparing Spanish-language newspapers in Miami, Los Angeles, and New York with newspapers from Havana, Mexico City, and San Juan (García, Fishman, Gertner, and Burenat 1985).

Another way to look at level of diffusion of lexical innovations is to establish how similar each type is to traditional usage, as shown in Table 2, and to determine how consistent or coherent the responses are for each type with respect to the variables of awareness, adoption, and acceptability. Figure 2 reproduces graphically the results of Table 2, that is, how much each type of innovation departs from the traditional Spanish dummy sentences. Phrasal calques clearly show the innovation that resembles traditional usage the most, and Phrasal calques also have the most coherence as, when compared to the other types of innovations, they show the least variation between awareness, use, and acceptability.

Phrasal calques, loanwords, and phonologically merged word calques are all instances of the creative adaptation of the Spanish language for the purpose of communicating English message types in a predominantly English-speaking society. In contrast, phonologically independent word calques appear to be the type of innovation least able to penetrate into US Spanish; they seem to be truly cases where interference because they, unlike the other innovations, represent a clear violation of the internal make-up of the linguistic sign.
Figure 2
Degree of Deviation of Each Innovation from Traditional Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Acceptability</th>
<th>Diffusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>Merged Calques</td>
<td>Merged Calques</td>
<td>Merged Calques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Phrasal Calques</td>
<td>Independent Phrasal Calques</td>
<td>Independent Phrasal Calques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummies</td>
<td>Dummies</td>
<td>Dummies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linguistic Proficiency of the Innovators

We selected those informants in our sample who claimed to speak and read and write well in Spanish, but not in English. We also selected those who claimed to speak and read and write well in both Spanish and English. We considered the first group our monolingual Spanish-speaking sample. The second group was classified as bilingual. We wanted to determine whether English proficiency had any effect on awareness, adoption, and acceptability of innovations.

As Table 3 shows, for both awareness and adoption both monolingual and bilingual speakers responded according to the pattern of the total sample. That is, whether monolingual or bilingual, they were most aware of loanwords, followed by phonologically merged word calques, followed by phrasal calques, and coming in last, phonologically independent word calques. The same was true and for the adoption variable. Whether monolingual or bilingual, they had the highest levels of adoption for loanwords, followed by phrasal calques, phonologically merged calques, and finally phonologically independent word calques.

The only slight deviation from the expected pattern occurs in the variable of acceptability. Our total sample had accepted phrasal calques the most, followed by merged word calques, independent word calques, and finally loanwords. But this was also the pattern followed by our bilingual subsample. Both groups showed that they accepted phonologically independent monolinguals were different in that they accepted phonologically independent word calques slightly more than phonologically merged word calques. That is, they accepted correr para gobernador more than registrarse en la universidad.

This pattern of acceptability by monolinguals, the reader will recall, closely resembles what we had originally expected but was contradicted by our general findings. We think that what is happening here is that the mechanism of blending of two signals that defines the phonologically merged word calque is not operative among monolinguals.

In other words, the phonological equation established by the similarity of signals in merged word calques, which prevents this kind of innovation from violating the integrity of the sign, does not occur among monolinguals, quite simply because they, in fact, do not know the English signal. If you are not familiar with English register for college then registrarse en la universidad is exactly the same as correr para gobernador. For monolinguals, phonologically independent word calques are the same, consisting simply of new Spanish signals that in the new speech community may be imagined. For people who know the traditional senses of both registrarse and correr, but who know no English, the new sense imported from the English register and are equally new, and equally acceptable.
Comparison between percentage of monolingual and bilingual respondents answering in the affirmative to questions regarding Awareness, Adoption, Acceptability, and Diffusion of four types of lexical innovations in the Spanish of Dade County, Florida.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hear it?</td>
<td>Use it?</td>
<td>judged to be Correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Word Calques</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Word Calques</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal Calques</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We had hypothesized that bilingual speakers would be more aware of the innovations, would adopt them more, and would accept them more. This, however, proved not to be true. In fact, although bilinguals are indeed more aware of all types of innovations than monolinguals, monolinguals actually adopt them all more and find them more acceptable than bilingual speakers. With regard to adoption, these results are similar to those obtained among French-English bilinguals in Canada by Poplack, Sankoff, & Miller (1987:52).

Again, we had to rely on information given to us by the respondents in order to try to make sense of this finding. Monolinguals are less aware of these innovations, it seems, because they are in environments where English is spoken less and where English influence is felt less. Yet they are more willing to adopt them and to accept them as correct because — as we now gather — they simply see the innovations as the Spanish of Dade County, as the way, that is, that this language is spoken in the new — and to them Spanish monolingual — community that, as all new communities, can be expected to have its linguistic quirks. Whereas bilingual speakers rely on the information they have about English in their decisions to adopt and to accept the innovations, monolingual speakers simply adopt them and regard them as acceptable on grounds of communicative effectiveness. For monolinguals, these innovations are simply characteristics of the Spanish of a new society.

It turns out, then, that despite what one might expect, monolinguals are better adopters of the innovations and more tolerant judges of their correctness. For them, innovations are adaptations of the Spanish system within a new speech community. For bilinguals, however, innovations remain elements from the English language that have found their way into the Spanish the community
Another possible explanation, although one that is not supported by our interviews, for the greater adoption and acceptance of innovations by monolinguals may lie in that they were less educated than our bilingual sample. Our monolingual and bilingual samples were comparable with respect to years of residency in the US, as 69 percent of the monolinguals, and 79 percent of the bilinguals, had lived in the US for over 10 years. However, our monolingual sample was less educated than our bilingual sample. Whereas of the monolingual sample only 62 percent had completed high school, 81 percent of the bilinguals had graduated from high school and 12 percent had completed college. We have no quantitative data to decide whether the relevant factor in the high adoption of loanwords is low level of competence in English or low level of education.

Conclusion

Spanish in Dade County, as in all of the United States, shows considerable evidence of lexical penetration from English. This influence is best seen as an instance of creative language adaptation on the part of a community that apparently wishes to continue speaking Spanish while communicating message types that are characteristic of an English-speaking society. In many cases, what appear to be linguistic innovations are simply new messages conveyed without changing traditional Spanish in any way. English-based innovations are so common in the Spanish of Dade County that they are widespread even among monolingual Spanish speakers. Clearly, it is bilingual speakers that first introduce these lexical innovations in the community. However, monolingual speakers adopt them in greater quantity, and accept them more readily, than bilinguals, because monolinguals consider them characteristics of Dade County Spanish and do not know that they are of English origin.

Speakers are interested in efficient communication of messages that are relevant to the majority society. They are not reluctant to introduce new signals and new meanings as long as they are correctly matched, but shun them when they create mismatches. In adopting innovations, these speakers take into consideration the communicative efficacy of the innovation as well as the linguistic integrity of the signs that are chosen. The language source of the sign selected by a speaker is not as important as fidelity in transmitting the message and respect for the relationship between signal and meaning. This degree of diffusion differs from one type of innovation to another. We have found that phrasal calques are the type of innovation most diffused in the Spanish of Cuban Americans in Dade County. Although loans are more readily adopted than phrasal calques, phrasal calques are judged to be more correct and, thus, their permeability into the Spanish of the community is far greater. This, in turn, we attribute to the fact that phrasal calques are cases of cultural, not linguistic, innovation.
It is safe to predict that as Cuban Americans become more assimilated, the need to communicate messages from the majority Anglo-American society will become far greater. The speech community will have no choice but to either adopt the lexical innovations that make communication of English messages possible or switch to English. Some of the social characteristics of the Cuban community are relevant here, particularly the still-strong sense of being exiles and the corresponding denial of the home country as a viable personal or historical alternative. Given the socioeconomic role of Spanish in Dade County, the psychological distance of Cuban Americans from their country of origin, their strong ties to the United States, and their apparent commitment to Spanish language maintenance, we can expect that the Spanish of Dade County will continue to import lexical innovations. This appears to reflect a trend toward becoming part of Anglo-American life while at the same time reaffirming the status of Spanish as the language of the Cuban-American community in the United States.
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APPENDIX A

Cuestionario

Este cuestionario forma parte de un estudio sobre el uso del español en los Estados Unidos. Por favor no ponga su nombre en el cuestionario. Indique la respuesta adecuada con una X.

1. Sexo
   ___ Hombre
   ___ Mujer

2. Edad
   ___ 13 a 17 años
   ___ 18 a 22 años
   ___ 23 a 30 años
   ___ 31 a 50 años
   ___ más de 51 años

3. Lugar de nacimiento
   ___ Estados Unidos
   ___ Cuba
   ___ México
   ___ Puerto Rico
   ___ República Dominicana
   ___ Centro América
   ___ Sur América
   ___ Otro país

4. Lugar de nacimiento de sus padres (Puede marcar más de una respuesta)
   ___ Estados Unidos
   ___ Cuba
   ___ México
   ___ Puerto Rico
   ___ República Dominicana
   ___ Centro América
   ___ Sur América
   ___ Otro país

5. Años de residencia en los Estados Unidos
   ___ 0 a 5 años
   ___ 6 a 10 años
   ___ más de 10 años

6. Nivel de escolaridad alcanzado
   ___ No terminé escuela primaria
   ___ Terminé escuela primaria
   ___ Terminé escuela secundaria
   ___ Terminé universidad
7. Profesión
   ___ Ama de casa
   ___ Agricultor(a)
   ___ Desempleado(a)
   ___ Estudiante
   ___ Maestro(a)
   ___ Obrero(a) o empleado(a) de servicio
   ___ Profesional
   ___ Propietario(a) de negocio
   ___ Vendedor(a), artesano(a), trabajador(a) técnico u oficinista

8. Origen étnico de la mayoría de sus vecinos
   ___ Norteamericanos, blancos
   ___ Norteamericanos, negros
   ___ Hispanos
   ___ Otros

9. Origen étnico de la mayoría de sus amistades
   ___ Norteamericanos, blancos
   ___ Norteamericanos, negros
   ___ Hispanos
   ___ Otros

10. Facilidad y proficiencia en la comprensión y el habla del inglés
    ___ Muy buena o buena
    ___ No buena o ninguna

11. Facilidad y proficiencia en la lectura y la escritura del inglés
    ___ Muy buena o buena
    ___ No buena o ninguna

12. Facilidad y proficiencia en la comprensión y el habla del español
    ___ Muy buena o buena
    ___ No buena o ninguna

13. Facilidad y proficiencia en la lectura y la escritura del español
    ___ Muy buena o buena
    ___ No buena o ninguna

14. Uso del español en el hogar
    ___ siempre o casi siempre
    ___ casi nunca o nunca

15. Uso del español en el trabajo
    ___ siempre o casi siempre
    ___ casi nunca o nunca

16. Uso del español en actividades sociales
    ___ siempre o casi siempre
    ___ casi nunca o nunca
17. Uso del español a través de medios de difusión
   A. Frecuencia con que Ud. lee revistas, periódicos o libros en español
      ___ siempre o casi siempre
      ___ casi nunca o nunca
   B. Frecuencia con que Ud. escucha la radio en español
      ___ siempre o casi siempre
      ___ casi nunca o nunca
   C. Frecuencia con que Ud. mira televisión en español
      ___ siempre o casi siempre
      ___ casi nunca o nunca

18. Su opinión sobre la importancia de ser bilingüe en los Estados Unidos
    ___ Muy importante o importante
    ___ No es importante

19. Su opinión sobre la importancia de que se mantenga el uso del español entre los hispanos en los Estados Unidos.
    ___ Muy importante o importante
    ___ No es importante

20. Su opinión sobre la importancia de que sus hijos reciban instrucción en español en el futuro.
    ___ Muy importante o importante
    ___ No es importante

21. ¿Cómo se identifica Ud. en cuanto a nacionalidad?
    ___ Como norteamericano(a)
    ___ Como de mi país de origen
    ___ En parte como norteamericano(a) y en parte como de mi país de origen
II. A continuación ofrecemos varios ejemplos. Por favor léalos y conteste si o no a las tres preguntas que se hacen sobre cada ejemplo, marcando su respuesta con un círculo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ejemplo</th>
<th>¿Ha oído Ud. la frase o palabra subrayada?</th>
<th>¿Usa Ud. La frase o palabra al hablar?</th>
<th>¿Considera correcto su uso al hablar?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necesito hacer un <strong>part-time</strong> para ganar dinero</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En la fiesta te voy a <strong>introducir</strong> a una señora muy agradable.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se levantaron tarde porque no <strong>tenían que trabajar</strong>.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregúntale si sabe <strong>cómo hacerlo</strong>.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su presencia hará la diferencia.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los aviones <strong>quedaron detenidos</strong> durante una escala en el Brasil.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El martes me <strong>registré</strong> en la universidad.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ese <strong>vacuum cleaner</strong> hace muchísimo ruido.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llama a Carlos y <strong>dile</strong> que venga inmediatamente.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se me olvidó <strong>tomar asistencia</strong>.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puso la <strong>alarma</strong> para despertarse a las 7:00 A.M.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrió para governador en las últimas elecciones, pero no ganó.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Tienes un <strong>quarter</strong> que me prestes?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejemplo</td>
<td>¿Ha oído Ud. la frase o palabra subrayada?</td>
<td>¿Usa Ud. la frase o palabra al hablar?</td>
<td>¿Considera correcto su uso al hablar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. El maestro les dio un examen muy difícil.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tengo que ir al dealer a pagar el automóvil.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tendré que ponerme a dieta porque estoy ganando mucho peso.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. El profesor les pidió que escribiera un papel.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ayer detuvieron a seis personas.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mi hijo estudió Real Estate.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Los trenes no están corriendo.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Antes de darle el piso a mi colega, el Senador Rodríguez, quisiera decirles otra cosa.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Quiero que camines al niño hasta la escuela.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. La tienda se encuentra cerca de los shopping centers más importantes.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tenemos que envolvernos todos para mejorar nuestras escuelas</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. El colegio está abierto hasta las once de la noche.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Los gobiernos anteriores no se hablan ocupado del asunto.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejemplo</td>
<td>¿Ha oído Ud. la frase o palabra subrayada?</td>
<td>¿Usa Ud. La frase o palabra al hablar?</td>
<td>¿Considera correcto su uso al hablar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Pusieron los <em>previos</em> de esa película.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. A la <em>hora</em> de <em>comer</em> se presentaron ocho personas.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Carlos está <em>fuera</em> de la ciudad.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. En esta tienda venden <em>appliances</em> y televisores.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Los niños hacen mejor en las escuelas privadas.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Hay niños que aprenden dos lenguas <em>simultáneamente</em>.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Hay que llenar una <em>forma</em> para abrir la cuenta.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Si se acaban los <em>radios</em> que están en venta siempre hay <em>rainchecks</em> disponibles.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. El médico la <em>examinó</em> y la encontró muy bien.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Este <em>próximo</em> fin de semana iremos al cine.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Con todos los problemas que tengo, lo <em>último</em> que <em>necesito</em> es un dolor de garganta.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Llené una <em>aplicación</em> para un trabajo en California.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. La <em>catedral</em> es el edificio <em>más notable</em> de la ciudad.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. <em>No pega</em> correr riesgos.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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