DOES THE TASK REALLY MATTER? THE ELICITATION OF NEGATIVE DOUBLING ACROSS FOUR TASKS IN CHIPILEÑO SPANISH

Olga Tararova
University of Toronto

1. Introduction

Some studies (e.g., Sankoff and Vincent 1980; Milroy 1987; Milroy and Gordon 2003) found that spontaneous interviews, a common method in obtaining adequate sample size for phonological phenomenon, might not be ideal when eliciting a morphosyntactic variable due to the low number of occurrences of the intended target structure. Given that analyzing a morphosyntactic phenomenon can be more problematic in terms of finding and identifying sufficient data (Milroy 2000; Milroy and Gordon 1998; Lavandera 1974) both experimental and traditional methods were used to elicit the appearance of negative doubling (ND) in the speech of bilingual Chipileño speakers in Spanish. In standard Spanish, the sentential negation is preverbal, as in (1):

(1) *Yo* ***no*** *hablo italiano*
I **NEG** speak Italian
'I do not speak Italian'.

The presence of another final *no* in declarative sentences is considered ungrammatical in Spanish, unless the final negator is part of a tag question with a rising contour, as in (2):

(2) *Jorge* ***no*** *come* *las enchiladas,* *¿**no**?*
Jorge NEG eats enchiladas, **NEG**?
'Jorge does not eat enchiladas, right?'

Since both examples in (1) and (2) are grammatical in Spanish, I treat them as cases of standard negation (SN). In Veneto, a Northern Italian dialect spoken in Chipilo, Mexico, negation can be preverbal, similar to (1) in Spanish. However, Veneto also exhibits cases of ND, which is formed as a combination of a preverbal negator and final *no*, as in (3). It is important to note that unlike Spanish, final *no* in Veneto has a falling contour, a characteristic of ND.

(3) *Io* ***no*** *so* ***no***
I NEG know-1SG **NEG**
'I do not know',

Actes du congrès annuel de l'Association canadienne de linguistique 2017.
Proceedings of the 2017 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association.

To my knowledge, there has not been an extensive study on negation in Chipilo, but a few studies (Barnes 2009; Tararova 2014) showed that final *no* has been transferred from Veneto into Spanish in the discourse of bilingual speakers. Thus, this project investigates the frequency of ND in Chipileño Spanish, using both controlled and semi-spontaneous tasks. More specifically, this project corroborates previous research on studying morphosyntactic variation and highlights the importance of analyzing the phenomenon through a combination of various tasks.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents a short overview of the studied community, followed by previous studies of negation in Chipilo and a section on studying morphosyntactic variation; Section 3 discusses the methodology, which includes subsections on participant criteria, tasks, stimuli, and analysis; Section 4 presents the results related to the ND frequency and task effect; Section 5 discusses the results and concludes the paper with possible future work.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Overview of the community

Situated south of Puebla, Mexico, Chipilo is a bilingual Veneto-Spanish community, which was founded in 1882 by Italian immigrants from Northern Italy. Unlike many minority languages, which usually weaken and are eventually lost after a few generations of speakers, Veneto is still spoken and acquired in most of the bilingual homes in Chipilo. It is important to mention that Veneto is an oral variety without any stratified written system, which has been still maintained up to the present day. Today, Veneto is mostly used in the informal and familiar setting, whereas Spanish is the dominant language of schools, social media, and other formal institutions. Previous research shows (e.g., Barnes 2009; Barnes and Michnowicz 2015), however, that many phonetic, prosodic, and morphosyntactic features have been borrowed from Veneto in the discourse of the bilingual speakers, and transferred to the majority language, Spanish.

2.2 Negation in Chipilo

To my knowledge, negation in Chipilo has not been studied extensively. In her dictionary, MacKay (2002) shows three possible variants of negation in Veneto:

(4) a. *No l'è grande*
b. *No l'è grande* ***no***
c. *No l'è* ***mía*** *grande*
'It is not big'.

(MacKay 2002: 82)

Example (a) is a prototypical preverbal negation; (b) and (c) are examples of ND, where the second negator either occurs sentence finally, as *no*, or after a verb, as *mía.* MacKay

(2002), however, does not provide information on the frequency of the phenomenon or describe any measures to elicit the negation.

Using both online listserv and sociolinguistic interviews, Barnes (2009) also briefly mentions ND, which she suggests occurs frequently in a spontaneous speech. However, she does not provide any quantitative results about the ND frequency. In my previous work (Tararova 2014), using data of semi-spontaneous interviews in Spanish from the corpus of Tararova (2012), I found very few cases of ND (n=6). Since in my previous work, ND was not the focus of my project, this study examines the frequency of the phenomenon in detail by implementing a variety of tasks.

2.3 Studying morphosyntactic variation

Researchers have argued that analyzing morphosyntactic variation can be problematic in terms of finding the best method and identifying the envelope of variation (Lavandera 1974; Milroy 1987; Milroy and Gordon 2003; Torres Cacoullos 2011). The interview method, commonly used to elicit a phonological variation, might not be the best one for studying morphosyntactic variation simply because a variable might not be used in a spontaneous 'free-topic' interview. The problem can also lie in obtaining a sufficient number of tokens to run a statistical analysis and discuss significant results. To gather sufficient data, Lavandera (1974) proposed a slightly different interview approach. In her study of *cocoliche* speech in Argentina, a variety spoken by Italian immigrants, she studied *if-clauses* in subjunctive mood and conditional clauses using the guided interview method. With a set of guided questions, she was able to gather data to analyze the phenomenon (cited in Milroy and Gordon 2003). In this project, I adopt her method and apply it to studying ND.

2.4 Research Question and Hypothesis

According to gaps in previous literature and observations about Chipileño Spanish, this paper[1] investigates the frequency and task effect of the morphosyntactic phenomenon and is guided by the following question:

What is the frequency of ND in Chipileño Spanish across four tasks?
Is the distribution of ND different according to each task?

In my previous work (Tararova 2014), the use of ND was infrequent in the speech of a few Chipileño bilinguals. However, since ND was not the focus of the previous project, the sample was relatively small. Since ND is the focus of the current project, I expect to obtain a larger sample with the combination of tasks. Since SN is a standard variant in Spanish, I expect to see a higher percentage of its use in comparison to the ND variant. However, since a number of linguists (e.g., Milroy 1987; Milroy and Gordon 2003)

[1] This paper is part of my doctoral dissertation, which analyzes the interplay of social and linguistic factors on elicitation of ND.

showed that it is usually much harder to obtain a sufficient number of tokens when studying a morphosyntactic variable in spontaneous speech, it is probable that more controlled tasks (e.g., Sentence Repetition Task, Preference Forced Choice Task, Sentence Completion Task) will elicit a higher percentage of ND contexts. In other words, I expect to find a relevant task effect when eliciting the phenomenon.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

For this project, 79 speakers were recruited to participate in the study.[2] All the participants were bilingual Veneto-Spanish speakers, 18 years and older, residing in Chipilo. They had no history of hearing problems. All of the participants were remunerated for their participation in this study.

3.2 Tasks and Stimuli

For this study, participants were presented with an elicited conversational speech and three experimental tasks: a Sentence Completion Task, a Sentence Repetition Task, and a Preference Forced-Choice Task. All four tasks sought to elicit the occurrence of ND in the speech of Chipileños. The first task, an elicited conversational speech was a short interview and included 20 open-ended questions to familiarize myself with the participants and to potentially elicit the cases with ND. The first set of questions was general about participant's background followed by more specific ones, which sought information about Chipileño speech and language attitudes, as seen in (5) and (6).

(5) Could you think of some characteristics of Chipileño speech? / What do they use differently from monolingual Mexican people?

(6) Does incorporation of Veneto features into Spanish make a Chipileño very/somewhat/not different from a monolingual Spanish/Mexican speaker?

The second task was Preference Forced-Choice task, which included nine short scenarios with two questions and three possible answers (*see* (7) as an example). The answers included one *default* option with one negator or NEG-word (SN), an ungrammatical option, and the marked option with ND. After listening to the story, participants had to select the option most appropriate to the context and then repeat it. The selection part of the task determined whether ND was the preferred option and the production part allowed me to hear whether the final *no* had a falling contour, a characteristic of ND, or a rising contour, a characteristic of a tag question or SN.

[2] My current dissertation includes a total of 123 participants of different ethnic groups (bilingual, monolingual, and mixed).

(7) *Rosario organizó una fiesta en su casa, pero nadie vino, ni siquiera su mejor amiga, Ana.*
'Rosario organized a party at her house but nobody came, not even her best friend, Ana.'

Question 1:	*¿Vino la mejor amiga de Rosario, Ana?* came the best friend of Rosario, Ana 'Did Rosario's best friend, Ana, come?'
Answer 1 (SN):	*No, tampoco vino*. no, neither came 'No, she did not come either'.
Answer 2 (ND):	*No, no vino tampoco **no**.* no, NEG came neither **NEG** 'No, she did not come either'.
Answer 3 (ungrammatical):	*No, no vino **no*** no, NEG came **NEG** 'No she did not come'.

The third task was the Sentence Completion Task. Participants heard nine incomplete scenarios interrupted by dog barking and had to complete the sentence. A sample example is shown in (8):

(8) *Luis pinta todos los días y María se supone que practique el piano. Ella no toca el piano suficiente porque prefiere salir con sus amigos. En cuanto al arte y la música lo importante es practicar. Luis pinta a diario pero María no…*
'Luis draws every day and Maria, supposedly, practices piano. She does not play piano enough because she prefers to go out with her friends. As for art and music, practice is important. Luis draws everyday but Maria does not…'

The last task was Sentence Repetition Task and included 41 isolated stimuli (18 target sentences and 23 distractors) for the participants to repeat. Participants heard a sentence with a flat intonation and were asked to help a "robot" learn to speak Spanish from the region by repeating the sentence using their normal intonation.

Stimuli for three controlled tasks were recorded by a bilingual Chipileño female speaker in Spanish. Chipileño speaker was chosen to produce the utterances due to her local speech accent, as well as her native ability to produce ND contours.

3.4 Analysis

With regard to the analysis, the elicited conversational speech was partially transcribed using the ELAN software program. Orthographical transcriptions included all utterances

in which participants used negation (one negator or two negators) in order to observe and compare the scope of variation of ND. With regard to the second task, the Preference Forced Choice Task, all options of SN and ND were extracted and analyzed using Praat software to determine the final contour. As for the Sentence Completion Task, responses were transcribed in ELAN and then analyzed in Praat, as well. Finally, as for the Sentence Repetition Task, isolated target sentences with final negation were analyzed also using Praat to determine whether final contour was rising or falling.

A number of tokens were excluded from the analysis according to specific reasons. 274 tokens were excluded from the elicited conversational speech because the responses included i) only the single word response *no*; or ii) sentential negation in a main clause followed by a dependent clause. In the Preference Forced Choice Task, 50 tokens out of 869 possible tokens were excluded because participants picked one of the ungrammatical or illogical answers. For example, *no, vino no* ('no, [she] came NEG'), is ungrammatical in both Veneto and Spanish due to the licensing principles of the negation. In the Sentence Completion Task, 59 tokens out of a total of 396 possible cases were excluded given that the participants either stopped after *no*, as in (9), or used a dependent clause with *porque* 'because', as in (10).

(9) *Rossana se va a vivir sola el próximo año pero aun no sabe cocinar. Entonces cada semana su mamá le enseña preparar cosas nuevas. Sin embargo, Rossana nunca puede recordar los ingredientes. La mamá siempre le dice a Rossana que tiene que anotar todo en su libreta, pero Rossana* ***no***
'Rossana will be living alone next year but she still does not know how to cook. Every week her mother teaches her new recipes. However, Rossana can never remember the ingredients. Her mother always tells Rossana to write it down but Rossana NEG'.
Participant: *pero Rossana no. Nunca va a ser buena cocinera*
'but Rossana no. She will never be a good cook'.

(10) *Hay tres trapos en la mesa. Luisa estaba limpiando todo el día pero se enfadó porque solo un trapo limpia bien sin dejar ninguna mancha. En cuanto a limpiar bien, un trapo limpia perfectamente bien pero los otros dos* ***no****…*
'There are three cleaning rags on the table. Luisa had been cleaning the whole day but she got frustrated because only one rag cleans well without leaving any stains. In terms of cleaning well, one rag cleans perfectly well but the other two NEG…'
Participant: *pero los otros dos* ***porque*** *están … pues está sucio el trapo*
'but the other two because they are… Well, the rag is dirty'.

In the Sentence Repetition Task, 50 cases of repetition without a normal intonation (i.e., resembling a robotic voice or using flat intonation) were excluded (out possible 1422 sentences).

Therefore, a total of 316 tokens of participants who varied (out of a total of 1585 cases, excluding 1427 distractors) were extracted and analyzed to determine which task had the most of effect on ND use. Using Goldvarb, I ran a binominal step-up/step-down

logistic regression analysis with task effect as the dependent variable to determine whether ND is a task-related phenomenon.

4. Results

This section presents the results of the study. First, I show the results of the frequency of ND according to each task, followed by the multivariable analysis of task effect on ND use.

The first task that participants performed was an elicited conversational speech. Table 1 shows the distribution of ND in comparison to SN in Chipileño Spanish. This accounts for a total of 310 tokens (excluding 274 tokens).

Table 1: Overall distribution of ND in elicited conversational speech

Forms of negators	**N**	**%**
Negative doubling	4	1
Standard negation	306	53
Total N		**310**

As Table 1 shows, ND occurred only 1% (n=4) of the time, whereas SN was the preferred variant (53%, n=306). These results support the initial hypothesis, the prediction that SN would be predominantly used in this task. The next Tables (2-4) show the results of the controlled tasks. Task 2 shows results from the Preference Forced Choice Task with a total of 217 tokens.

Table 2: Overall distribution of ND in the Preference Forced Choice Task

Forms of negators	**N**	**%**
Negative doubling	76	35
Standard negator	141	65
Total N		**217**

As seen in Table 2, SN is still the preferred variant in Chipileño Spanish (65%, n=141), but the distribution of ND is more frequent in this task than in the previous one. Table 3 shows the distribution of ND in another controlled task, which is Sentence Completion Task. This accounts for a total of 395 analyzed tokens.

Table 3: Overall distribution of ND in the Sentence Completion Task

Forms of negators	**N**	**%**
Negative doubling	7	2
Standard negator	328	83
Total N		**395**

Table 3 shows that ND is used at a very small rate in comparison to the SN variant: 2% (n=7) and 83% (n=328), respectively. Lastly, Table 4 shows the overall distribution of ND in the Sentence Repetition Task. This accounts for a total of 514 tokens.

Table 4: Overall distribution of ND in the Sentence Repetition Task

Forms of negators	**N**	**%**
Negative doubling	219	43
Standard negator	295	57
Total N		**514**

As seen in Table 4, similar to the previous tasks, SN is still the preferred variant in Chipileño Spanish. However, the discrepancy between SN and ND is relatively small: 57% of SN in comparison to 43% of ND.

In sum, the results from all four tasks show that SN is the preferred variant in Chipileño Spanish. However, as seen from Tables 1-4, the distribution of the ND variant is different in each task. Therefore, I ran a multivariate analysis of the effect of task, coded as a dependant factor on 79 participants in each task, with a total of 316 bilingual participants in four tasks to see whether ND is a task-related phenomenon.

Table 5: Step-up/step-down multivariate analysis of the effect of each task selected as significant to the probability of participant responses to opt for ND and SN.

Corrected mean		0.2	
Log likelihood		-133.495	
Total N		316	
	FW	**%**	**N/Total**
Task			
Sentence Repetition	**.80**	41	32/79
Preference Forced	.**72**	30	24/79
Choice	.24	5	4/79
Elicited Speech	.24	5	4/79
Sentence Completion	*56*		
Range			

According to Table 5, task effect has a significant effect for eliciting ND. More specifically, the Sentence Repetition and Preference Forced Choice Tasks triggered the highest number of ND tokens. Moreover, as seen from Table 5, 41% speakers (n=32) and 30% speakers (n=24) produced a mixed set of two variants in the Sentence Repetition Task and the Preference Forced Choice Task, respectively, in comparison to only four speakers who used some ND in the elicited conversational speech and in the Sentence Completion Task. These results suggest that the participants favoured the use of ND in the two controlled tasks only, which partially support the initial hypothesis.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

One of the aims of this study was to identify the presence and frequency of ND in Chipileño Spanish, in comparison to SN. Overall, the data from all four tasks showed that, as predicted in the Hypothesis, SN was the preferred variant. However, the relative distribution of SN and ND was different across these four tasks. The first task, the conversational speech, elicited only four tokens with ND (1% out of all possible cases with negation). One interpretation of this finding is that the phenomenon of ND is not common in spoken speech. Another possibility is that the task itself might have included few contexts in which ND is appropriate or stylistically used. It is possible that ND is constrained to certain contexts, and its prevalence is thus so low that it may not be easily captured with this highly naturalistic method. The omission of some features in the elicited conversational task does not always suggest that the phenomenon is rare; its restriction to a specific context, as mentioned, is another explanation. During the elicited speech, a few participants mentioned the existence of the ND phenomenon and its frequent use among many bilingual speakers in both Veneto and Spanish. Given the fact that I am not a local Veneto speaker but rather an 'outside' researcher, it is possible to conclude that some participants may not have felt comfortable enough to speak freely about their life, taste, and other topics, and thus their spontaneous speech might not have been fully natural. This is consistent with observations made by King (2000:54), who claims that it is very challenging to gather and reveal the full repertoire of individual speakers, much less the entire speech community, in sociolinguistic interviews or other traditional data elicitations if the interviewer is not local.

Two controlled tasks, the Preference Forced Choice and the Sentence Repetition Tasks, elicited higher numbers of tokens with ND than did the first task. As mentioned in section 3, the Sentence Repetition Task was the least contextualized task, which only focused on repeating the sentences using normal intonation. Therefore, it is possible to assume that tasks with less context trigger more ND tokens because the participants are less conscious of the nature of the task when repeating after a robotic voice. Interestingly, the other two controlled tasks, which were similar in number of target scenarios showed opposite results. The results from the Preference Forced Choice Task suggest that participants are more conscious of the presence of ND when selecting from a number of 'natural' responses. Finally, even though the Sentence Completion Task was a controlled task, it elicited very few tokens. Since participants were restricted to a specific scenario, it is possible to assume that ND was not favoured in those given contexts.

Future research regarding the distribution of ND in Veneto in Chipilo would be worthwhile to conduct in order to see whether the phenomenon occurs at the same rate as in Spanish. Using the same tasks, these future results would determine whether ND in Chipileño Spanish behaves similarly as in Veneto. Also, following King's (2000) observations, it would be interesting to run the future experiment by a local resident because it is possible that the results could potentially be different due to more familiarity between the local and the participant. Finally, the elicited conversational task could be modified by simultaneously interviewing two or three people, since my previous research

found cases of ND while interviewing three participants at the same time. The inclusion of two or three people could potentially show significantly different results since the participants would be guiding their own conversation.

In general, this project corroborates previous discussions on analyzing a morphosyntactic variation and suggests that studying a morphosyntactic variation can be problematic if only the interview method is used. As mentioned above, the variable might not be used due to a number of reasons. Therefore, using a variety of tasks allows the researcher not only to elicit the variable, but also examine it in depth.

References

Barnes, Hilary. 2009. A Sociolinguistic study of sustained Veneto-Spanish bilingualism in Chipilo, Mexico. Doctoral Dissertation, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University.

Barnes, Hilary, and Jim Michnowicz. 2015. Broad focus declaratives in Veneto-Spanish bilinguals: Peak alignment and language contact. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 8: 35-57.

Boersma, Paul and David Weenink. 2017. Praat: doing phonetics by computer. Version 6.0.28

King, Ruth. 2000. *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing: A Prince Edward Island French case study.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lavendera, Beatriz. 1974. On sociolinguistic research in New World Spanish: A review article. *Language In Society* 3(2): 247-292.

MacKay, Carolyn J. 2002. *Il dialetto Veneto di Segusino e Chipilo: fonologia, grammatica, lessico veneto, spagnolo, italiano.* Cornuda, Treviso:Grafiche Antiga

Milroy, Leslie. 1987. *Observing and analysing natural language: a critical account of sociolinguistic method*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.

Milroy, Leslie, and Matthew J. Gordon. 2003. *Sociolinguistics: method and interpretation.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Sankoff, Gillian, and Dianne, Vincent. 1980. The productive use of *ne* in spoken Montreal French. In *The social life of language*, ed. Gillian Sankoff, 295-310. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tararova, Olga. 2012. *A Study of In-Group and Out-Group Attitudes in an Italo-Mexican community, Chipilo.* Master Dissertation, University of Guelph. URL http://dspace.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/browse?value=Tararova%2C+Olga&type=author

Tararova, Olga. 2014. No hablo italiano (no). Poster presented at LSRL 44, Western University

Torres Cacoullos, Reina. 2011. Variation and grammaticalization. In *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics,* ed. Manuel Díaz Campos, 148-167. Oxford: Blackwell.