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This study uses natural, everyday social interaction within Salvadoran families living in Southern California to examine the use of the 2nd-person singular pronouns tú and vos (and their corresponding morphologies) in this contact variety of Spanish. An in-depth, qualitative analysis reveals that the employment and significance of these forms of address do not conform entirely to Salvadoran norms, nor to those of the surrounding Mexican-based Spanish koiné. Accommodation to the pronominal repertoire of the region’s majority serves as a communicative resource driven by questions of U.S./Los Angeles identity and solidarity with speakers’ in-the-moment interlocutor(s), a process which has caused the original Salvadoran pronouns to also be reallocated and refunctionalized (Britain and Trudgill 1999) as resources for accomplishing Salvadoran identity. Members of this community make active use of their pronominal options in real-time interaction as they navigate the fluid, multifaceted identities that they and their interlocutors now embody in the U.S. context.

Este estudio se centra en las interacciones sociales diarias de familias salvadoreñas que viven en el sur de California para examinar el uso de los tratamientos tú y vos (y su morfología correspondiente) en esta variante de español en contacto con otros dialectos del español. Un análisis cualitativo revela que ni el empleo ni el significado de estos tratamientos siguen enteramente las normas salvadoreñas ni los usos de la koiné mexicana de Los Ángeles. La acomodación al repertorio pronominal empleado por la mayoría de los angelines sirve como un recurso comunicativo que se debe a cuestiones de identidad estadounidense/angelina y solidaridad con el interlocutor del momento. Tal proceso ha causado que los pronombres salvadoreños originales se hayan redistribuido y refuncionalizado (Britain y Trudgill 1999) como recursos utilizados por los hablantes para realzar su identidad salvadoreña. Los miembros de esta comunidad usan activamente sus opciones pronominales en interacciones en tiempo real mientras van navegando con las múltiples identidades que sus interlocutores (y ellos mismos) han adquirido en el contexto norteamericano. [Spanish]
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INTRODUCTION

The study of personal pronouns and forms of address in language is not a novel academic pursuit: both early grammarians and philologists as well as modern linguists, sociologists and anthropologists have all found themselves interested in the ways in which conversationalists refer to one another in interaction. This continued interest over the years is well justified given both the diversity that exists in the world’s languages with regard to pronouns (cf. Braun 1988) and also the changes that can and do occur over time and across communities. Here, we aim to contribute to this field of inquiry by illustrating the adaptability of a pronominal system found in a situation of dialect contact.

The present study examines 2nd-person singular pronoun usage tendencies in a specific variety of Spanish, namely that spoken by individuals of Salvadoran origin living in Southern California. We contextualize the investigation by briefly outlining the pronominal system of the Spanish of El Salvador as well as that of the Mexican-based Spanish majority of the southwestern United States. The target phenomena then emerge as speakers of the former dialect relocate to the general speech community of the latter. A qualitative, micro-level analysis of naturally-occurring social interaction within these Salvadoran families permits an exploration of processes of self- and other-identification, dialect accommodation, and solidarity, revealed on a moment-by-moment basis within the ongoing talk. These pronominal options effectively become tools for navigating the complex, fluid landscape of identities in which these Salvadoran-born individuals now find themselves, in in-home discourse. It is additionally argued that such qualitative approaches to identity construction can serve to further illuminate the micro-processes involved in generating the more overarching conclusions reported in quantitatively-based sociolinguistic research.

TWO SPANISH PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS IN CONTACT

While Spanish is often conceptualized in the aggregate as a single, ‘global’ language which maintains a standard T-V distinction (Brown and Gilman 1960), sociolinguistic inquiries have uncovered complex variation which exists amongst the multiple dialects of modern Spanish with regard to 2nd-person pronoun usage (cf. Hummel, Kluge and Vázquez Laslop 2010). Voseo, tuteo and ustedeo (the use of vos, tú and usted, respectively) are employed in distinctive ways in different regions, which naturally raises the question as to what occurs when a pair of these diverse pronominal systems comes into contact with one another. Below, two such dialects which are in contact in Southern California are described: Salvadoran Spanish (in El Salvador) and the Mexican-based Los Angeles Vernacular Spanish (LAVS), with emphasis on the pronominal repertoire and accompanying morphology of each.
Salvadoran Spanish (in El Salvador)

The Spanish of El Salvador has traditionally been categorized as a *tierras bajas* dialect (Menéndez Pidal 1962). The country shares, with the majority of its Central American neighbors, an array of phonological features which distinguish it from various other dialects of Spanish: aspiration of */s*; velarization of */n/; */y/-weakening; */y/-epenthesis; etc. (Canfield 1981; Lipski 1994; Parodi 2003, 2004). Additionally, lexical items such as *cipote, chele* and *pacha* are common in place of the more widespread *niño, guéreo* and *botella/mamila* for ‘child,’ ‘blond/fair-haired’ and ‘baby’s bottle,’ respectively.

With regard to the pronominal system, El Salvador, again like much of Central America, differs socio-contextually as to which set(s) of 2nd-person singular pronouns is/are used. Despite the extensive use of *vos* in everyday interaction (Benavides 2003; Lipski 1994), the form has historically been socially stigmatized as uncivilized and inappropriate for ‘official’ contexts; thus, it has not traditionally been taught in schools or heard in the news media, for example, where *tú* operates in its place. The long-reported stigma assigned to *voseo* in this region appears to be decreasing, though, as *vos* is increasing its presence in such official arenas. Using statistical significance tests, Quintanilla Aguilar (2009) recently found that *voseo* is, in fact, not associated with incorrectness, rudeness, low social class, femininity or shallowness – all of which were previously-reported, commonly-held stereotypes about the use of *vos* amongst Salvadoran speakers. In short, in the general speech community of El Salvador, *vos* is undoubtedly the everyday pronominal norm.

The verbal morphology distinctions between *tuteo* and Salvadoran *voseo* are minute, most often the difference of only a single vowel or stress placement between conjugations, for example: *vos habla* (*/a.blas/) vs. *tú hablas* (*/a.blas/) ‘you talk,’ or *vos escribes* (*/es.kri.bis/) vs. *tú escribes* (*/es.kri.bes/) ‘you write.’ Furthermore, many tenses/moods (i.e. imperfect indicative, imperfect subjunctive, conditional) are identical for *vos* and for *tú*: *vos hablabas, tú hablabas, ‘you used to speak,’ in Salvadoran conjugations. Note also that, despite this sometimes distinct verbal morphology, *voseo* and *tuteo* do have many grammatical points of convergence: *te* as the (in-)direct object and reflexive pronouns, *tu* as the possessive adjective, and so on.

Los Angeles Vernacular Spanish (LAVS)

Shifting now to the United States context, the 2006 American Community Survey reports that approximately half (48.9%) of the population of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area is Spanish-speaking. Long having noticed the gap in research on Central Americans in this region, Parodi (2003, 2004, 2009, 2011) used their presence to provide evidence for the existence of a Los Angeles Vernacular Spanish (LAVS) which is used throughout Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside and Ventura (and possibly other) counties in Southern California.
Parodi claims that the LAVS variety of Spanish is based on rural Mexican dialects which undergo processes of leveling in the urban areas of Southern California, creating what she calls a ‘rur-urban koiné’ (cf. Kerswill 2002). In addition to not participating in any of the phonological processes mentioned above for Salvadoran and other Central American Spanish varieties, LAVS uses solely tuteo/ustedes without any tendency toward vos, and thus we immediately see a discrepancy between this pronominal system and that of Salvadoran Spanish. Furthermore, Parodi (2004, 2009, 2011) affirms that, in general, Southern California Chicano Spanish speakers consciously and overtly stigmatize the use of vos. This has been reported elsewhere in the literature as well given that vos morphology is a salient characteristic easily detected by the tuteante majority in the area, the result often being explicit teasing of individuals who use vos (cf. Hernández 2002; Schreffler 1994). LAVS speakers – including those of Salvadoran heritage – have been quoted as referring to the vos as ‘weird’ and even ‘gross’ (Raymond 2012). Such stigma is invariably fueled by the origin make-up of Southern California Latinos: the largest group consisting of individuals of Mexican origin (70%), while the next most numerically present group is Salvadorans at only 12.6% (United States Census 2006).

SALVADORANS IN THE U.S.: PREVIOUS CONTEXTS AND METHODOLOGIES

With the exception of the aforementioned studies by Parodi, researchers have focused almost exclusively on communities in Houston, Texas when investigating contact between Salvadorans and other groups in the United States (e.g. Aaron and Hernández 2007; Hernández 2002, 2009; Lipski 1988; Schreffler 1994; amongst others). Each of these studies reports some level of accommodation of Salvadoran norms (phonological, morphological and/or lexical) to Mexican ones, given that Mexican Spanish speakers are the majority in Texas just as they are in California.

The methodologies employed in these investigations nonetheless do vary. Schreffler (1994), for example, reports the use of vos at home between siblings, from parents to children, and from grandparents to grandchildren. The author arrives at these conclusions by instructing consultants to create dialogues from pictures. The reliability of such a conscious task to accurately represent unconscious pronominal use is debatable, however, as speakers may not be cognizant of the fine-grained level of detail displayed in natural discourse (cf. Sacks 1984a, 1992). Hernández (2002) describes accommodation of vos to tute in interviews with Mexican Spanish speakers. From this interview methodology, though, we cannot be sure if this is a temporary ‘Mexicanization’ of speech due to the interview context, or whether this accommodated register is the normal, everyday dialect of the speakers. Additionally, given the previous discussion of pronominal practices in El Salvador, could the use of tú in such interviews not simply be an example of these speakers adhering to their
Salvadoran norm of *tuteo* in ‘official’ or ‘formal’ situations? Furthermore, what happens in different contexts: at home vs. work vs. church, etc.?

Rivera-Mills (2011), Woods and Rivera-Mills (2012) and Raymond (2012) have noted the need for studying Salvadorans both in other areas of the United States as well as with diverse methodologies. These researchers have investigated Central American communities in the (north-)western U.S., with spontaneous conversation (to varying degrees) factoring into their analyses. In line with previous studies, they too report a diminished use of *voseo* morphology across generations.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF NATURALLY-OCCURRING DATA

The present study analyzes the contact between Salvadoran and Los Angeles Vernacular Spanish pronominal practices in everyday discourse situated in the home. What pronouns are these speakers using in ordinary, familial interactions: *voseo* (following the Salvadoran example), *tuteo* (following the LAVS example), a mix? Moreover, what can these moment-to-moment usages reveal about greater questions of identity in this region?

The methodology used in investigating these questions is a naturalistic one: no tasks or tests were designed for participants to complete, and the researcher only posed language usage/ideological questions after these natural settings had been completely recorded. That is, video cameras and/or audio recorders were simply added to various ordinary family gatherings – dinners, celebrations, casual chats, homework sessions, and so on – to capture spontaneous, everyday talk-in-interaction amongst family members (cf. Heritage and Atkinson 1984: 2–5; Sacks 1984a).

A total of twenty families of Salvadoran origin were video- and/or audio-recorded. All were working class, reflecting the socio-economic status of the majority of Southern California Salvadorans (United States Census 2006). All of the households were comprised of two parents who immigrated to the United States from El Salvador as adults, and their children (numbering from one to five, and ranging in age from newborns to 25 years of age) who were all born and raised in Southern California. Quite often, other family members (cousins, aunts and uncles, etc.) and friends would visit the family and also participate in the interactions. Each family was recorded on multiple occasions; thus, the same participants were observed with various interlocutors in a variety of discursive contexts. The recordings were first transcribed and subsequently analyzed.

THE DATA: DISTRIBUTION OF VOSEO AND TUTEO AMONGST SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SALVADORANS

In this section, we present data in the form of single speech events as well as multi-turn, multi-participant sequences. The focus here centers on the *distribution* of *vos* and *tú* amongst the interactants in these families; we reserve
discussion and analysis thereof for the following section once all of the data has been presented.

**Salvadoran-born – Salvadoran-born interactions**

The first trend which reveals itself across these informal, in-home interactions is that those who were born and raised in El Salvador and immigrated to the United States maintain the Salvadoran pronominal norm of *vos* with those who share this same identity. For simplicity, let us call this group Salvadoran-born. As is common practice in many dialects of Spanish, momentary switches to *usted* to display extreme closeness, to reprimand, etc. are also occasionally observed. Nonetheless, *tú* is not found in Salvadoran-born speech directed toward Salvadoran-born interlocutors. A variety of examples of Salvadoran-born – Salvadoran-born turns-at-talk are listed in examples (1)–(7) below.

1: Father to mother (italics = English translation)

> Pero ya lo hacés todos los días.
> But *you vos* already do it everyday.

2: Mother to father

> ¿Por qué no lo podés hacer *vos* mismo?
> Why *can’t you vos* do it *yourself vos*?

3: Mother to her sister

> Ey, Cheli, ¿*vos* vas a ir a la pari?
> Hey, Cheli, *are you vos* going to go to the party?

4: Mother to her brother

> ¿No tenés hambre? Me dijeron que no *comiste vos*.
> *You’re vos* not hungry? They told me *you vos* didn’t *eat*.

5: Father to his sister

> ¡Andá, Mari!
> *Go vos*. Mari!

> *Vos* la conocistes también, ¿verdad que sí?
> *You vos* met her too, right?

6: Mother to nephew

> ¿No vinieron con *vos*? ¿Por qué no les *distes* un raite?
> They didn’t come with *you vos*? Why didn’t *you vos* give them a ride?

7: Father to Salvadoran-born friend

> ¿Cómo *estás vos*?
> *How are you vos*?

> Seguí trabajando allí, ¿no?
> *You’re vos* still working there, right?

This brief set of examples illustrates that being born/raised in El Salvador elicits *voseo* from others with the same identity. This is revealed in the
dataset most often between parents (husbands and wives directing their speech to one another, as in (1) and (2)); however, parents also treat their own siblings (and siblings-in-law) in the same way (as seen in (3)–(5)). Examples (6) and (7) are included to demonstrate that this is not a practice solely employed within the nuclear family or with a certain generation or age group. In example (6), the Mother’s nephew is 15 years old and has just arrived from El Salvador. She and the other Salvadoran-born individuals consistently use vos with him, and he does the same with them, although they have never spoken to him before (he was born after the family had left El Salvador for the United States). Furthermore, in (7), the Father exclusively uses vos with a Salvadoran-born friend – whom he met through work after arriving in the U.S. – when this individual comes to the house for an informal visit.

Note that there are no examples of Salvadoran-born individuals treating non-Salvadoran-born interlocutors (e.g. their children, to whom we turn next) as vos. This was not observed in any of the interactions recorded in this study (but see (17) below). While this is far from making the claim that no Salvadoran-born speakers preserve the voseo with non-Salvadoran-born individuals in Southern California, it does reveal a quite pronounced trend in casual interactions amongst members of this community. Here it seems that national identity is playing a role in what pronominal form is used amongst interlocutors, while other factors – sex, age, date of arrival to the U.S., familiarity with the individual prior to immigrating to the U.S., and so on – appear secondary compared to that of Salvadoran-born identity.

Interactions involving non-Salvadoran-born individuals

The children of these families, born and raised in Southern California – let us call them non-Salvadoran-born for simplicity’s sake – use solely tuteo, with all interlocutors, and show no inclinations toward the voseo that they hear used between Salvadoran-born speakers. This corresponds with Parodi’s (2003) original findings that those raised from an early age in Southern California adhere to the Los Angeles Vernacular Spanish norms not only in terms of phonology (e.g. no /s/-aspiration), but also in terms of morphology (tuteo only). Furthermore, on a more general note, children and adolescents have been shown to participate more actively in koiné and koiné formation (Kerswill 1996). In addition, though, here we find that Salvadoran-born individuals (such as those described in the previous section) also use tuteo with these non-Salvadoran-born interactants, just as they do with completely non-Salvadoran (e.g. Mexican) individuals. Take examples (8)–(13) below.
8: Daughter to mother
So, tú puedes ver fotos de tus amigos.
So, you\textsubscript{[ref]} can see your friends’ pictures.

9: Mother to daughter
Y tú, ¿qué le dijiste?
And you\textsubscript{[ref]} what did you\textsubscript{[ref]} tell her?
Solo vienes los fines de semana,
You\textsubscript{[ref]} only come on the weekends.

10: Son to mother
¿Cómo que no tienes que participar?
What do you mean you\textsubscript{[ref]} don’t have to participate?

11: Father to son
Entonces dile que llegamos como a las cinco.
So tell\textsubscript{[ref]} him that we’ll get there around five o’clock.
El problema es que tú haces todo y los demás, nada.
The problem is that you\textsubscript{[ref]} do everything and the others, nothing.

12: Mother to child’s friend (Mexican)
¿Quieres algo, Nancy?
Do you\textsubscript{[ref]} want anything, Nancy?

13: Daughter to father, aunt, sibling
Tú vas a ir. Tú vas a ir. ¿Tú, Jamie, are you gonna go?
You’re\textsubscript{[ref]} going to go. You’re\textsubscript{[ref]} going to go. You\textsubscript{[ref]} Jamie, are you gonna go?

Firstly, interactions between parents and children are dominated by tuteo. The non-Salvadoran-born children treat their Salvadoran-born parents as tú, as seen in (8) and (10); and they receive the same treatment from their parents and other Salvadoran-born family members, as seen in (9) and (11). Note that this is the same treatment that Salvadoran-born individuals use within the home to address all other non-Salvadoran-born individuals such as their children’s Spanish-speaking (usually Mexican) friends (e.g. (12)). Finally, between siblings, there is an overwhelming preference for English. Example (13) is one of the only instances in the corpus in which a sibling directly speaks to her sister in Spanish. In this case, the speaker is going around the table, pointing from one person to the next and verifying the attendance of each at an upcoming event. The first two instances are directed at her father and aunt, and the third instance is directed at the speaker’s sister. Although she does initially treat her as tú, her default 2nd-person reference form for all interlocutors, she immediately reformulates and continues in English. This is true for the children’s Spanish-speaking friends as well. Salvadoran or otherwise, all of whom receive tú from these non-Salvadoran-born individuals whenever the interaction is taking place in Spanish.
In short, tuteo is the only form used by these non-Salvadoran-born individuals in in-home talk. And not only do they exclusively use this form themselves, but they exclusively receive tuteo as well from interlocutors, regardless of the Salvadoran identity of said interlocutor.⁶

**Tú and vos from the same speaker**

Given that Salvadoran-born individuals possess both tú and vos in their pronominal repertoire, how they go about deploying them in actual discourse merits further elucidation. The isolated speech act tendencies outlined in the previous two sections are solidified as we look now at how a single speaker can make use of both pronouns within the same unfolding interaction.

Prior to the beginning of excerpt (14) below, Ana claimed that her youngest son, Andrés, does not want to go to a specific amusement park because he does not like roller coasters. The children present (Laura and Marco), joined by their father (Ana’s brother-in-law), then joke that it is actually Ana herself who is scared of roller coasters and that she is just using her son as an excuse not to go. The conversation then changes direction momentarily as the participants discuss the transportation situation. It is at the end of this tangent that the excerpt begins.

14: Roller coasters⁷

1  Mother: Entonces los chicos van con Marta y vos con nosotros.
   So the boys will go with Marta and you vos with us.

2  Ana: No, no puedo.
    No, I can’t

3  Father: ¡Ah:::
   ¡((negative assessment))

4  Laura: ¡Siempre dices que no puedes! Right, Marco?
   You [tu] always say you [vos] can’t! Right, Marco?

5  Marco: Don’t ask me!

6  Laura: She always says the same thing!

7  ¡Siempre dices lo mismo, tía!
   You [tu] always say the same thing, Auntie!

8  Mother: Ya déjala, Laura.
   Leave [vos] her alone already, Laura.

9  Father: Es que tiene miedo ella, por eso. ((laughs))
   It’s because she’s scared, that’s why.

10 Mother: Dejala, Juan, por favor.
   Leave [vos] her alone, Juan, please.

11 ¿Qué querés que haga con Andresito?
   What do you [vos] want her to do with little Andrés?
12 Father: ¿No tenés babysitter?  
**You[^vos]** don’t have a babysitter?

13 Ana: Eh::: ¿ cómo se llama esa (0.2) la que vive allá en este:::  
Um::: what’s that girl’s name (0.2) the one who lives  
¿?  
¿Paula?

14 Mother:  
15 Ana: No la otra.  
No the other one.

16 Mother:  
17 Ana: Em:::  
No, sí Paula. **Tenés** razón.  
No, yeah Paula. **You’re[^vos]** right.

18 Father: Pues ¿ por qué no **hablás** con ella vos?  
Well why don’t **you[^vos]** talk to her?

19 Ana: ¿ Pero como siete horas?  
But like seven hours?

20 Como ciento cincuenta dólares, ¿ verdad?  
That’s like a hundred and fifty dollars, right?

21 ¿ Por qué no te **quedas tú**, Marco? ((big smile, laughs))  
Why don’t **you[^rel]** just stay behind, Marco?

22 All: ((laugh))

23 Marco: Psh no! I’m going! ((laughs))

In Excerpt (14), the rapid ability to shift pronouns is particularly evident in comparing the Mother’s lines 8 and 10. Immediately prior to this, in lines 6–7, Laura makes a joke at her Aunt Ana’s expense, and her Mother reprimands her with line 8 using *tuteo*. Following this, Laura’s Father pokes fun at Ana as well with his own line 9. His wife sanctions him in the same way as she just did their daughter – with the same verb *dejar* ‘to leave’ – except that she uses *voseo* morphology in constructing the turn. Thus, in lines 8 and 10 we are presented with a minimal pair of sorts: an imperative issued within the same interactional event, for the same interactional purpose, but with distinct morphology which corresponds to the Salvadoran-born and non-Salvadoran-born norms described above. Note also that, when Ana finally addresses Marco (her nephew), jokingly inviting him to stay behind and take care of little Andrés, she changes to *tú* despite the previous several turns with her fellow Salvadoran-born family members in which they all used *vos*.

Seemingly contrary to what has been shown thus far, there are, in fact, cases of Salvadoran-born individuals using *voseo* while speaking to non-Salvadoran-born recipients. However, this occurs not when speakers are referring to their non-Salvadoran-born co-participant in interaction, but rather when they are reporting speech which transpired between Salvadoran-born individuals. The following two narratives were produced at the same family dinner. First, in excerpt (15), the Mother is explaining to
her daughter (Jandi) and to the rest of the family present, what happened
the prior Christmas when her brother was supposed to come visit from
Texas.

15: Christmas visit (Raymond 2012: 312)
1 Mother: ¿Y sabes qué, Jandi?
   And you know what, Jandi?
2 Luego mi hermano se fue a Las Vegas y no avisó.
   Then my brother went to Las Vegas and didn’t tell us.
3 Pero cuando vimos a mi hermano como una semana después,
   But when we saw my brother like a week later,
4 Entonces le dijimos que (0.2)
   We said to him,
5 ‘Vos, tuviste que haber hablado;
   ‘You should have said something
   ‘Vos, tuviste que haber hablado;
6 Para decir que no podías venir,
   To tell us that you couldn’t come,
7 Pero vos lo que hiciste es que ¡te fuiste a Las Vegas sin decir nada!’
   but you did is that you went to Las Vegas without saying anything!’

Here, the Mother first addresses her daughter directly in line 1 with tuteo. Once
she moves into the narrative, though, she begins to use voseo as she quotes
speech in which her own Salvadoran-born brother was her interlocutor. Given
that Spanish is a pronoun-dropping (pro-drop) language and that the preterit/
imperfect morphology of tuteo and voseo can be identical in some speakers, one
must look at the entire discursive context in these ambiguous cases to properly

Figure 1: Seating arrangement for excerpt (16)
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determine which pronoun is being employed at any given point. The explicit use of the pronoun vos in lines 5 and 7 indicates that all of these conjugations are, in fact, voseo.

In excerpt (16), again we see story-prefacing elements at the beginning of the narrative which make explicit reference to the to-be recipients of the telling. Here the Father recounts some events which recently occurred at a church gathering. Figure 1, above, shows the layout of how the participants are seated around the dining table during the telling, each being listed by his/her relationship to the Father (the story-teller).

Observe how the morphology of the teller changes as his gaze – indicated in the transcript with arrows – moves back and forth from his brother to his daughter.

16: Church Pupusas* (被迫 indicate gaze-transition points, shown in the diagram immediately below each line)

1 Father: Son hermanas de de la iglesia que son cristianas pues,
They’re sisters of of the church who are Christian and so,

2 y ellas sin conocerla, pero una vez que sos cristiano,
and they didn’t even know her, but once you’re[vos] Christian,

todos bien amables, todos.
everyone’s really friendly, everyone.

4 Si a ti te miran, ‘Hola, hermana, ¿cómo estás?’
If they see you[vos]. ’Hi, Sister, how are you[vos]?’

5 Te dan la mano y este todo, va.
They shake your[vos] hand and everything, right.

6 Y entonces este, ya después que fuimos a la, a la cena, va.
And so, after we went to the dinner.
que fue la comida, va, este, a mi ella
with the food, um, she

me dijo este, ‘Dá’ este ‘Andá’ este, ‘Quiero traer pupusas.’
she said to me ‘Give\textsuperscript{vos}’ um ‘Go\textsuperscript{vos}’ um ‘I want to bring pupusas.’

Wife: ¿La nueva?
The new one?

Father: No, la Guadalená.
No, it was Guadalená.

Ya, este, yo estaba en la iglesia, y va llegando ella también
Um, so I was in the church, and she comes up too

que quería pupusas, haciendo línea también.
because she wanted pupusas too, and was waiting in line too.

Y salte un, un hermano,
And there you\textsubscript{tu} get a, a brother,

¡Hermana! le dijo,
‘Sister!’ he said to her,

‘Fíjate que tengo tres horas de estar aquí adentro,
You\textsubscript{tu} know I’ve been waiting in here for three hours,

esperando pupusas, y no puedo–’ Ya de, ya, el señor, este,
just waiting for pupusas, and I can’t–’ And um, the man, um, happy, right,

con ella, va, que quería pupusas, que tenía hambre.
with her, right, that he wanted pupusas, that he was hungry.

Y vino ella al señor, ‘Gracias, hermano (0.2) ¡amé::((laughter))!’
And she went up to him, ‘Thank you, Brother (0.2) ameeeen((laughter))!’

The father begins his telling in line 1 by looking at his daughter. At the beginning of line 2, he shifts his gaze to his brother and a voseo conjugation results: ‘sos’/you
are (cf. tú eres). (Note also the masculine agreement on the adjective ‘cristiano’/Christian.) He shifts his gaze back to his daughter at the end of line 3 on the emphasized word ‘todos’/everyone. Given that the speaker’s gaze is now once again directed at his daughter, lines 4 and 5 show tuteo. (Note now the use of the feminine ‘hermana’/sister.) This directed reciprocity is emphasized by the father’s hand-shaking motion which accompanies his gaze, aiming both in his daughter’s direction. Again, on the emphasized ‘todo’/everything, his gaze shifts back to his brother. In lines 6 and 7, the speaker looks down at the table and at his wife before returning gaze to his daughter in line 8. In line 8, we see the same sort of quoted voseo that we saw in excerpt (15): the nun that the Salvadoran-born father is quoting is also Salvadoran-born, and thus their interaction together at this church event is expectedly reported with voseo imperatives, regardless of the identity of the immediate hearer(s).

After a brief interruption from the teller’s wife and his subsequent clarification of which nun this was, the father returns his gaze to one of his primary recipients, his brother, as he continues his narrative in line 11. At the beginning of line 13, the teller shifts and looks at his daughter once again, referring to her directly with tuteo through the framing device ‘sálete.’ At the next line, his gaze moves back to his brother to quote the speech of a priest (revealed to be Mexican through other talk), done with tuteo. Thus, in line 14, we have non-Salvadoran-born (Mexican) tuteo speech reported to a Salvadoran-born interlocutor, just as we saw Salvadorn-born voseo speech reported to a non-Salvadoran-born interlocutor in line 8. These speakers are thus actively and rapidly taking into consideration an entire constellation of identities – not only their own and those of their current interlocutor(s), but also those of other actors, authors, principles, etc. evoked in and through their talk – in their electing to use voseo or tuteo in interaction (cf. Goffman 1981; Goodwin 2007).

**Repair**

Despite the regularity of this distribution, it cannot go without mention that speakers are not always perfect in real-time, ongoing discourse. Indeed, there are a few instances in the corpus of Salvadoran-born parents mistakenly using vos with their children. We characterize these person references as ‘mistakes’ not in a prescriptive or theoretical sense, but rather because they are oriented to as such by the speakers themselves through the immediate initiation of repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977).

As a brief illustration of this, one family meal finds a mother and father sitting at one end of the table and their two teenage sons at the other, each pair involved in its own unrelated conversation in Spanish and English, respectively. At one point, the father turns away from his wife in the middle of her turn, shifts his gaze toward his eldest son, and produces example (17) below.
17: Father to Son

Escuchame Jua- Digo escúchame Juan. Esta noche me vas a revisar los biles, ¿verdad?

Listen to me Jua-I mean listen to me Juan. Tonight you’re going to go over the bills for me, right?

Prior to this utterance, the father was speaking with his wife, using voseo as expected. When she mentions something that reminds him of paying bills, he suddenly shifts his focus to his son, inappropriately referring to this new recipient as vos as well in producing the imperative ‘escuchame’/listen to me (pronounced [es.ku.’ʃa.me]). The speaker himself quickly orients to his having misspoken through the mid-turn cutoff on ‘Juan’ and the repair initiation device ‘digo’/I mean before producing the repair proper, a tuteo imperative ‘escúchame’/listen to me (pronounced [es.’ku.tʃa.me]). This speaker’s ‘mistake’ and subsequent self-correction further solidifies the distribution outlined above. That is, the fact that the Father actively halts his turn-in-progress in order to replace voseo morphology with tuteo morphology demonstrates that he considers voseo to be problematic as a person reference form for this particular interlocutor, for whom tú is offered up as a more appropriate option.

Summary: Dialect divergence

To summarize the data presented above, at a basic, descriptive level of analysis we observe a distribution of pronouns and morphology which can be conceptualized as in Table 1. Non-Salvadoran-born participants in interaction use only Los Angeles Vernacular Spanish (LAVS) tuteo with all interlocutors. Salvadoran-born interactants use voseo with other Salvadoran-born individuals but LAVS tuteo in making direct reference to non-Salvadoran-born hearers.

This distribution emphasizes the lack of Salvadoran-born norm usage by non-Salvadoran-born speakers, as Parodi (2003, 2004, 2009, 2011) has previously reported. It is important to note that these results differ from those found in Rivera-Mills (2011) and Woods and Rivera-Mills (2012) on Central Americans in other communities which do preserve some voseo in younger generations. Nonetheless, what is especially highlighted by the present study is the adaptation of the Salvadoran-born speakers’ pronominal system to incorporate

Table 1: Tuteo-voseo distribution in Southern California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Salvadoran-born</th>
<th>Non-Salvadoran-born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran-born</td>
<td>voseo</td>
<td>tuteo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Salvadoran-born</td>
<td>tuteo</td>
<td>tuteo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the pronominal norms of LAVS. \textit{Tuteo} is not used to address one’s children in El Salvador (cf. Lipski 1988: 114), and is generally used only in formal contexts (Quintanilla Aguilar 2009). This in-home Salvadoran-LAVS dialect contact situation has thus produced a meaningful morphological change within this community of speakers: inside the Southern California Salvadoran household, the discursive contexts of use and the meanings of \textit{tuteo} and \textit{voseo} have been ‘reallocated’ (Britain and Trudgill 1999) compared to their original, pre-migration uses and meanings. In other words, \textit{tú} and \textit{vos} are each doing something ‘more’ in these interactions than is reported to be the case in average LAVS-only and Salvadoran-only discourse, respectively.

\textbf{DISCUSSION: PRONOUNS AND IN-THE-MOMENT SOCIAL IDENTITY}

Given the distribution of interlocutors and pronouns found in the Southern California Salvadoran home, the question remains as to what is being \textit{socially accomplished} through the use of one of these pronominal alternatives over the other. That is, what is this ‘something more’ that this reallocation process has achieved?

Processes of accommodation are inextricably linked to interlocutor identities. Indeed, as Salvadoran-born individuals engage in talk with non-Salvadoran-born recipients in the Southern California context, the former accommodates to the norms of the latter, thereby establishing a common identity and minimizing the social distance between the interactants (cf. Shepard, Giles and LePoire 2001). This, combined with the fact that non-Salvadoran-born individuals exclusively use \textit{tuteo} and therefore do not accommodate to Salvadoran-born \textit{voseo}, underscores LAVS’s status as the diglossic high variant in this particular contact situation (Parodi 2009, 2011).

As a specific resource within this overarching process of accommodation, the innate sociality of person reference as it relates to identity cannot be overlooked. In assigning an address term to a referent, a speaker not only shows how s/he views the identity of that referent, but also how s/he views his/her own identity. If A views B as having \textit{more} social power (for example) and therefore as deserving of a certain address term, A simultaneously self-labels, reciprocally marking himself as having \textit{less} social power. This notion can be traced to Brown and Gilman’s (1960) original explanation of classic T-V distinctions. Applied to the facts of present study, the use of \textit{tuteo} or \textit{voseo} with an interlocutor labels both the interlocutor’s as well as the speaker’s identity, particularly with regard to national origin; and by extension, solidarity relations can be consistently (re)created and maintained through these identity evocations. Similar to claims made in language ideology-based studies, we argue here that the dialect divergence and accommodation processes present in the Southern California Salvadoran home have reallocated the meanings and uses of both \textit{tú} and \textit{vos} amongst these interactants as tools for actively
accomplishing solidarity with the distinct, multi-faceted identities present in interaction.

Britain and Trudgill (1999: 245) originally refer to ‘reallocation’ as a feature of koinés themselves in describing that it ‘occurs where two or more variants in the dialect mix survive the leveling process but are refunctualized, evolving new social or linguistic functions in the new dialect.’ Yet here we observe that linguistic features may also be reallocated – and thereby take on new social functions – in situations of dialect contact which result in bidialectalism and frequent style-shifting (Bell 1984; Coupland 2008a) as well, specifically through individuals’ lack of accommodation to/participation in the koiné. The Salvadoran-born speakers in this study all possess the LAVS tuteo, as is evident in their use of the form in speaking with non-Salvadoran-born interlocutors. Nonetheless, they actively employ vos with one another to the complete exclusion of this other alternative that they also have in common. It is in this context that vos refunctualizes from a simple 2nd-person singular pronoun (as it is in normal Salvadoran speech) into a tool for ‘doing’ Salvadoran-born solidarity and presentation of self with other Salvadoran-born interlocutors, just as their use of ti demonstrates their actively ‘doing’ a U.S./Los Angeles presentation of self to show solidarity with non-Salvadoran-born individuals (cf. Goffman 1959, 1981). This is particularly evident in the story-telling examples (cf. excerpts (15) and (16)) in which both pronouns are used in order to display solidarity with both Salvadoran-born and non-Salvadoran-born identities as each becomes relevant at different points in the ongoing talk.

One of the basic claims about koiné development is that ‘for a koiné to form, the speakers must waive their previous allegiances and social divisions to show mutual solidarity,’ this solidarity being what gives rise to the aforementioned processes of accommodation (Kerswill 2002: 673). The examples included in this study illustrate the speed and precision with which such displays of mutual solidarity can be achieved and navigated by speakers as they orient to their various interlocutors’ identities on a moment-by-moment basis in interaction. We are thus reminded that accommodation need not replace a given dialectal feature or practice, but rather it can provide speakers with additional discursive resources to deploy in social interaction as they deem necessary. That is, ‘waiv[ing] previous allegiances and social divisions’ in order to participate in a koiné may be a momentary shift which serves to publicly display a different side of a speaker’s versatile identity. Contrary to Trudgill’s (2008) description of accommodation as a process for which identity is ‘irrelevant,’ here we are presented with a form of recipient design which operates at the dialectal level via person reference and which quite categorically takes into account speaker and recipient identities, turn-by-turn, in order to actively ‘do being’ (Sacks 1984b) in solidarity with each.

On a more general note, this reallocation of pronominal forms is indicative of language systems’ plasticity: languages can and do adapt and evolve according to the needs of the community in which they are employed. Accordingly,
following Tuten (2008: 261), ‘we may want to claim not that the formation of community identity is a consequence of koiné formation, but rather that community identity formation and koiné formation are simultaneous and mutually dependent processes.’ Due to the fact that their own (and their interlocutors’) identities and speech patterns shifted upon relocating to Southern California, Salvadoran-born speech adapted in a way which is capable of reflecting their newfound need for additional, distinct displays of solidarity and identity as they engage in everyday social interaction.

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

This study aimed to examine, in detail, the complexity with which pronouns are used in a specific community, namely amongst Spanish speakers of Salvadoran origin in Southern California. A micro-level analysis of turn-by-turn social interaction involving these interactants revealed processes of ‘doing identity’ and demonstrating solidarity that can be achieved through deployment of the various dialectal resources at their disposal. In explaining the differences in usages between Salvadoran-born and non-Salvadoran-born speakers in this context, the versatility of language systems to adapt to (newly) relevant identities becomes especially evident. The intricate system used by these speakers illustrates the level of specificity with which interactants are able to manage their reference to and invocation of their multiple identities in real-time, moment-to-moment discourse.

We must underscore, though, that these are in-home practices; other Salvadoran-born–Salvadoran-born interactions outside of the home – in a Mexican-dominated workplace, for example – may show different bidialectal tendencies, possibly in attempts to avoid discrimination. Further studies should investigate such individuals’ speech in other, less familiar environments.

Additionally, the processes of acquisition and socialization which lead to this very consistent system merit more direct attention in future research. Do non-Salvadoran-born individuals begin using tuteo first, possibly due to their LAVS peer group, and so their Salvadoran-born elders soon follow suit? Or does the latter group explicitly use tuteo with the former so as to better socialize them into the Mexican majority and avoid anti-Salvadoran prejudice? Analyses of recently immigrated Salvadorans who are just beginning to have children are necessary to approach these issues.

In pursuing these (and other) questions of identity as they relate to language use, further in-depth, qualitative methods are crucial to compliment quantitative results. In the present study, a purely quantitative description of individual speaker production would have indeed reported the sole use of tuteo by non-Salvadoran-born individuals, as well as an increased use of tuteo by Salvadoran-born individuals in these interactions. Nonetheless, while a numerical account would have reflected the strictly linguistic outcomes of the dialect contact situation, the fluid identities of these dialects’ speakers – the
very driving forces behind those linguistic outcomes—would have potentially been blurred. With regard to methodology, then, it is essential to bear in mind that, as Coupland (2008b: 268) explains, ‘it is people, not merely dialects, that are in contact, and [those] interpersonal and intersubjective dimensions of language use are where explanations for change must lie.’

NOTES

1. First and foremost, I must thank the families who so graciously (and repeatedly) invited me into their homes and allowed me to record their intimate moments. This study simply would not have existed without their participation. This research is a product of the Centro de Estudios del Español de Estados Unidos (CEEEEUS) at UCLA. I thank its director, Claudia Parodi, as well as its members for valuable feedback during the project’s development. The incorporation of gaze into the analysis was inspired by coursework and talks with Chuck Goodwin. The final version greatly benefited from the detailed comments of two anonymous reviewers and from the Journal’s editors. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own.

2. Compare, for example, the first comprehensive grammar of the Spanish language, Antonio de Nebrija’s Grammatica della Lingua Castelliana (first published in 1492), with the recent edited volume by Enfield and Stivers (2007).

3. The informal 2nd-person plural vosotros (note the historical etymology: vos +otros, ‘you+others’) form has disappeared almost entirely from Latin America (with the exception of a few isolated rural areas), being replaced by exclusive use of the previously formal form ustedes in all 2nd-person plural contexts (cf. Moreno de Alba 2011). We thus focus our attention in this work on the singular pronouns, as dialectal variation is more readily detectible in these forms.

4. Due to considerations of space, our discussion is necessarily limited; however, numerous studies on the use of voseo (and different types of voseo) in specific communities are available. It must be noted that voseo morphology does differ from region to region; thus, Salvadoran, Argentine and Chilean voseantes, for example, do not always conjugate their verbs in the same way. See Benavides (2003) and Páez Urdaneta (1981), and references therein, for a more complete overview.

5. It is possible that families who immigrate to the United States after already having children in El Salvador, and who then have additional children in the U.S., pattern differently. We leave this matter open for future research.

6. The situation may be different if a native Salvadoran were visiting the family temporarily from El Salvador, such as the addressee of example (6) above. Such an individual may continue with his/her normal use of voseo with all interlocutors just as s/he would in El Salvador (cf. Quintanilla Aguilar 2009), or s/he may accommodate temporarily to the Southern California koiné. There are very few interactions of this sort in the present dataset, so no definitive conclusions can be made here.

7. In transcripts (14)–(16), open brackets (‘[’) indicate overlap between speakers, colons (‘:’) indicate lengthening, numbers in parentheses (e.g. ‘(0.2)’) indicate
the length of pauses (in seconds), and information in double parentheses (e.g. ‘((laughs))’) are transcriber notes.

8. Pupusas are a traditional Salvadoran dish: maize flour tortillas filled with any combination of cheese, beans and/or meat and served with cabbage slaw and tomato salsa.
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