Tabea Salzmann

# Language, Identity and Urban Space

The Language Use of Latin American Migrants

# 1. Introduction

```
"En la interacción entre lo urbano y lo rural para mí es
una vida cotidiana. Además este, esa relacióng no solamente
es dinámica sino también es casi intercultural, porque yo
sí valoro de lo que son de acá y son de allá. No estoy cla-
ro en los dos frentes, pero estoy aquí y estoy allá. Mejor
dicho, si estoy en Lima hablo el castellano de Lima, si
estoy a Ayacucho hablo el castellano de Ayacucho. O sea, he
tratado de superar algunas bar:eras lingüísticas o socio-
lingüísticas."
```

```
(In the interaction between the urban and the rural, for me
it is an everyday life. Also, this relationship is not only
dynamic, but also almost intercultural, because I do value
those who are from here and from there. I am not clear on
both fronts, but I am both here and there. Or better, if I
am in Lima I talk the Spanish of Lima, if I am at Ayacucho
I talk the Spanish of Ayacucho. So, I have tried to over-
come some linguistic and sociolinguistic barriers.[1])
```

This quotation from one of the persons recorded for this investigation brings us straight to the core of our subject matter: linguistic interaction of urban migrants in diverse spaces. The speaker is a professor from Ayacucho, and one of the better educated persons in the corpus. He describes very tangibly how he and many other migrants constitute their personal identity. Their manner of life and their linguistic interaction are formed in ever changing everyday situations. He constructs and conveys his identity according to each new encounter: he incorporates features derived from urban culture and rural culture, of a more mestizo and a more indigenous flavour, from being one of the people and one of the better educated, from different varieties of Spanish and even from Quechua. He does this not only by his choice of words; his use of language also speaks for itself in the way he chooses linguistic features of varied origin to represent the content on the surface level of language.

## 1.1 The Issue at Hand: Linguistic Interaction in Situations of Migration in Urban Spaces

My interest here is to analyse migrants' language usage in diverse urban spaces to see specifically how language and communication work in interaction in these

---

1    José, 110 ff. When I give translations of parts of the transcription I try to imitate the grammatical constructions the speaker uses. The numbers in the references refer to the number of lines found in the original transcript.

particular situations. The aim is to examine everyday informal migrant conversations in urban spaces more closely. This will show us just how language is used, so that we can then distinguish the mechanisms and discourse strategies migrants use to communicate meaning on various levels. The levels of meaning consist of, for example, the practical information given at the moment of speaking and references to the situation on various levels. More importantly, however, they also refer to the constitution of identity at the moment of communication, conveyed by their language usage.

Based on the hypothesis that language usage and communication reflect processes taking place in the formation of identity, I hope to investigate how migrants constitute their identities dynamically through linguistic interaction.

In both cases - that of linguistic interaction and that of identity formation - the hypothesis is that we are concerned with open dynamic processes. Therefore we cannot speak of self-contained entities which only come into peripheral contact. Rather the situations present themselves as complex nets of interrelations.

The exemplary case taken here is the Hispanophone world, more specifically migrants originating from the Andean region, now living in Lima and Madrid. Migrants' language use and communication in migration situations involving Spanish linguistic interaction in these two spaces will be analysed and compared with regard to similarities and differences. This should ultimately give us information on the hypotheses posited above.

I intend to develop these hypotheses step by step, relating the theoretical approach applied to the actual spaces analysed.

Gumperz (1971, 220) stated as early as 1971:

> "The basic position with respect to the coding of social information was stated by Hymes (1962), who asserts that both language and language usage are structured and suggests that it is language usage rather than grammatical categories per se which most closely reflect social influences. This implies that from the sociolinguistic point of view every utterance has both social and referential meaning."

Language usage therefore tells us more about ties with factors found on levels above the microlevel of communication than pure grammar can. Gumperz states the connection between the context of linguistic interaction and social life very clearly. It is the task of the investigator to see how they work together.

Considered here are two groups of migrants from the same region of origin, the Andes, with different destinations in migration: Lima, as an example for Latin America and Madrid as its European counterpart. The aim is not to follow the lines of a traditional dialectologic or sociolinguistic approach. I do not intend to look at one specific group of migrants, consider their language usage in their current situation and compare the results with the language use of non-migrants in the same space or with that of non-migrants in the space of origin. This would give a description of current use of linguistic features, from which a traditional approach would then extract a description of, for example, an apparently stable variety, with influences from other varieties. Such an approach would postulate two or more

separately existing varieties and compare them mostly on the grounds of differences in assumed stable grids of rules.

My interest, however, is in examining the specific effects of situational communication in heterogeneous situations of linguistic interaction. These include many different factors influencing the situation and the interaction, to which the interlocutors have to adjust each time anew. The assumption then, is that situational interaction is a combined process that develops through the way migrants choose and use the linguistic possibilities at hand, relying on specific influences delivered by the situation. The result is an open, dynamic process of language use and variation. In everyday linguistic interaction, varieties which are perceived as similar or very different typologically encounter each other. Such situations are typical for urban spaces, but they are difficult to isolate. Migrants per definition find themselves confronted with contact in all its forms and have to cope with communicative tasks that arise from these situations. But these are not tasks and situations that only migrants have to deal with. Nowadays they are also true for many other contexts. The migration context is a specific case in which such situations arise, due to highly varied contact situations arising from constant movement in diverse spaces. Analysis of language usage and communication in situations of migration in urban spaces, might then make it possible to derive knowledge for other heterogeneous situations of linguistic interaction. The first aim is to examine whether concepts and strategies in interaction that facilitate communication exist or develop and what these might be. Once these have been identified one could consider whether they can be generalized for situations outside the context of migration. In a second step, I intend to trace the manner in which these strategies are used to map out identity in communication.

An integral approach that takes into account all the necessary factors is required to answer both these questions. A consideration of the context in all its facets is of vital importance for the understanding of the linguistic interaction analysed.

## 1.2 Review of Literature

The task undertaken here has not been performed in extenso up to now. Many of the areas that form part of an integral, holistic approach in the field of linguistic ecology as understood here, are well explored in extensive literature. This will be demonstrated for example in the field of Latin American Spanish, especially that of the Andes, Spanish in Madrid, sociolinguistics, language contact for the spaces and varieties concerned here and for ecological approaches of linguistics, in order to place my work and the approach chosen in context and to show how this can produce new fruit in the area of linguistic ecology and Spanish dialectology.

Spanish in Latin America has been described as being part of traditional dialectology by such scholars as Kany (e.g. 1969), who gives a general account of the syntax of Latin American Spanish, or Fontanella de Weinberg (e.g. 1993), who undertakes a general review of Latin American Spanish and the standard literature

in each field. These are, however, traditional approaches, similar to those of for example Moreno Fernández (2014), who writes a manual on Hispanic dialectology, or Alvar (1996) with a manual on Latin American dialectology. They remain purely descriptive of both regional norms and of recurrent phenomena in phonetics, phonology and morphosyntax, and lack a theoretical foundation or a corpus of field research on the basis of which the phenomena can be understood. Lipski on the other hand (e.g. 1994), is one of the scholars who researches Latin American Spanish widely, although he specialises in phonetic-phonological aspects. He also describes language contact in many of his articles, without however using a holistic approach to the object of investigation. A more strongly rooted approach can be found in de Granda, who describes the contact between Spanish and Quechua in the Andes from a historical point of view and develops a theoretical line of thought regarding standardisation and convergence (e.g. in de Granda 2002). This is a perspective that, while describing historical settings, tends towards socio-political aspects and remains on the macro level without following through to the actual linguistic interaction that takes place on the micro level with references to the meso level. Authors who have published work more specifically on Spanish in the Andean region, especially Peru, such as Escobar (1978) and Cerrón-Palomino (2003, 2000, 1994), also often pursue a traditional dialectological approach. Here the description of phonology plays the main role while other aspects of language (see e.g. Escobar 1978) are marginal. Escobar brings a sociolinguistic perspective to the fore, relating such phonetic-phonological phenomena to social class and Quechua-Spanish bilingualism. In this respect he also takes into account migrants and migration as a factor that influences language. The most extensive work in this field has been done by Cerrón-Palomino (e.g. 2003, 2000, 1994), who covers aspects of contact between Spanish, Quechua and Aymara, and writes generally about Andean Spanish taking, for example, word order and syntax into account, a definite improvement on (almost) purely phonetic-phonological works. Often these are connected with aspects of normativity. Again though, the connection between analysis on the micro level and interrelations with the meso and macro level tend to be left out.

Caravedo (2007, 2006, 2005a and b), one of the more recent investigators, explores these two levels through the connection between traditional dialectology and historic settings as well as socio-political aspects such as norm, perception and attitude.

Godenzzi (e.g. 2008a, 2008b, 2007, 2006, 2005) represents the approach nearest to a holistic point of view in the field of Latin American Spanish. His articles and monographs on Andean Spanish from Lima to Puno take into account micro level analysis of corpus based aspects of phonology and morphosyntax etc. and combine these with meso and macro level perspectives on language policy, sociolinguistics and identity. He also often works specifically with migrants and/or bilinguals. His approach remains in the geographical Andean space, without taking Spanish in other parts of the world into account.

This step has only lately been taken by Palacios (e.g. 2011, 2009, 2007, 2005), who has published articles on Spanish mainly from Paraguay and Ecuador as well

as on the Spanish of Latin American migrants in Madrid. Separate articles take a look at, for example, pronoun systems and variation or aspects of identity, but do not usually make connections between these various levels or between different geographic spaces in a comprehensive overview. This might be gained by taking all her work into consideration, but she has not expressly written about it.

Regarding peninsular Spanish, especially of Madrid, standard works by Alvar and Quilis fall into the traditional fields of dialectology and sociolinguistics. Alvar (e.g. 1983) specialises on lexis and historical aspects, but has worked extensively on dialectology, while Quilis (e.g. 1983) covers such fields as phonetics and phonology, in which he specialises, and has also written some works on pronouns, lexis, prosody and intonation. Altogether the field of dialectology in Madrid seems to contain many desiderata for future research. Corpus based works on Spanish related to everyday linguistic interaction are few and far between.

Some of the aspects discussed fall under the category of syntax. This is an area widely investigated in many languages. Labov (2001) for example, approaches the subject from the perspective of linguistic change. Givón (2009, 2001, 1995) on the other hand, analyzes universal grammatical structures in various languages at the intersection of syntax, pragmatics and semantics. For Spanish syntactical structures Bosque/Demonte (1999) write a detailed descriptive grammar.

Many of the aspects taken into consideration, fall into the category of sociolinguistics traditionally. Garfinkel, in his "Ethnomethodological studies of work" (1986), wrote about one decisive aspect that applies to everyday social interaction and thus also to language: the irremediable vagueness that is always included in all situations, permitting understanding as well as preserving openness towards interaction. Keeping this in mind, one of the first to describe the connection between social life and language was Dell Hymes (1972), who (also) approached the subject from an ethnological point of view. Inspired by Garfinkel and Goffman, Sacks (e.g. 1992) and Schegloff (also more recently e.g. 2007) developed conversation analysis as another means of understanding language and communication in discourse, in connection with social life. Here the focus of attention lies on the micro level of analysis, considering turn-taking and sequence analysis in conversation, and is thus a more interactive level than those considered by traditional dialectological approaches. Gumperz (e.g. 1982a and b, 1974), who worked together with Dell Hymes, on the other hand developed an interactional approach in sociolinguistics and analysed not so much how discourse in conversation developed as Sacks and Schegloff did, but rather characteristics of social interaction such as discourse strategies and their connection with social identity. These basic investigations form part of the foundation for later more holistic ecological linguistic work. They also combine well with methods such as social network analysis originally used by sociologists. The social network approach in linguistics often includes taking a look at the exact socio-historic and infrastructural constitution of the spaces the networks are situated in. Thus Milroy (1987) considers members of linguistic networks in Belfast within certain communities and undertakes a description of these using the network approach. She relates her findings to phonetic-phonological

phenomena elicited through corpus based field research and therefore takes into account natural language (see also Milroy/Muysken 1995). However, these works remain on the meso level and neither connect all three levels nor different spaces in comparative analysis. In line with discourse analysis and conversation analysis as well as network analysis we find works by Tannen (e.g. 1989, 1984), who combines these approaches. She investigates conversational style as a means of making interaction function, but also as a way of explaining misunderstanding and failure in conversation. This kind of approach takes a closer look at linguistic mechanisms such as repetition and imagery in explanations of its findings. Here again, we find ourselves mainly on the micro level of analysis, that is the actual linguistic interaction. The meso level that influences conversational style is taken into account, but with very little regard for the socio-cultural, even less for the historical, perspective either on the meso or the macro level. Another approach is adopted by Bruno Illius' "Das Shipibo: Texte, Kontexte, Kommentare: ein Beitrag zur diskursorientierten Untersuchung einer Montaña-Kultur" (1999). Illius analyses types of communication and their relation to types of culture and also such aspects as gender, social position, orality, and ceremoniality.

What most fields reviewed up to this point lack are the aspects of comparison and language contact. These tend to be closely related, since comparative analyses appear mostly in analyses of language contact. Language contact has been researched from a very early point in the development of linguistics. One of the first scholars to write explicitly about languages in contact was Weinreich in 1953. Since then, investigations nowadays considered to be basic theoretical writing on language contact followed. Amongst these is the groundbreaking work by Thomason & Kaufman on contact induced language change and creolisation, which presents a model of how contact induced change can lead to language maintenance or language shift and creolisation on a long-term basis encompassing various steps. Based on such approaches and further developments we can find more differentiated models for example in Pagel (2015)[2]. Since these approaches ultimately consider the historic macro level of long term change and its outcome historically, I will not include them unless they contribute to the understanding of the issues at hand in the analysis of linguistic results, for the focus of this work does not include this aspect. Other scholars have done research on topics nearer to the field of contact linguistics in which I am interested, such as Trudgill (1991), who writes on dialect contact, an aspect closely related to the issues discussed. The diverse varieties present in the situations of Andean migrants in the urban spaces of Lima and Madrid could be considered to be dialects of Spanish (see chapter 2.2.3). In his book "Dialect Contact" Trudgill only refers to phonetic-phonological aspects in dialect contact and therefore achieves results that are not representative for all aspects of

---

2   In his model Pagel combines all known language types into a continuum oriented between structural reduction and structural congruence through language contact, which can lead to code maintenance, code creation and code shift.

linguistic interaction (see chapter 2.2.4). Nevertheless, as one of the basic works for the topic at hand Trudgill is of importance. These investigations can be considered to be part of the framework for the methodological perspective. The interpretation of the actual analysis, set in this frame, can be undertaken more successfully with the theoretical approach supplied by contact linguistics on the micro level, namely the field of borrowing, switching or copying[3]. The basis here will be a framework developed by Ludwig/Kriegel/Salzmann (to appear). This combines aspects and terminology from Myers-Scotton (2002) such as matrix and embedded language, and, more importantly, ideas from Johanson's code copying (see e.g. 2006, 2002) instead of borrowing/switching and such aspects as overt and covert copies (see chapter 2.2.4). In a further step the results from the corpus analyses will be interpreted, taking such aspects into consideration, but also for example that of markedness (e.g. Matras 2006)[4]. Thus the field of contact linguistics yields many important instruments for the interpretation of the data. Combining it with variational linguistics and more specific fields such as pragmatics, grammar, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics etc. can bring us closer to a comprehensive overall perspective such as I intend to pursue.

The aspect of migration, for example, is often neglected. One monograph that tries to consider both language contact and migration is "Kontinuität, Erosion und Innovation des Italienischen im Migrationskontext" by Kristin Reinke (2011), which gives an insight into language change amongst Italians in Montreal. The general aim is the description of long-term change, correlating the results of the corpus-based analysis with socio-cultural information about the migrants. However, the comparison undertaken belongs more in the field of traditional dialectology, considering phenomena in the corpus in comparison with varieties spoken in Italy. Migration and the general socio-cultural settings on the meso and macro level are only taken into account when they concern the migratory background of the speakers.

In such a method as that aimed at here, aspects of culture and personal, as well as collective, identity (fields not altogether alien to linguistics) are also of importance and should be considered more specifically than most of the above mentioned works do. One work on language and identity that considers personal aspects of identity and migration, is "Bilingual couples talk, the discursive construction of hybridity" by Ingrid Piller (2002). Here migration in combination with aspects of identity is explored through conversation analysis based on a corpus, focussing on personal and couple identities constructed in linguistic interaction.

---

3    Other scholars, who have done extensive work in this field are for example Poplack & Sankoff on code switching, borrowing and accomodation.
4    Another interesting field here might be bilingualism, mixed languages, triggering etc., investigated by such scholars as Muysken (1997) or Clyne (2003). For interpretative reasons that will become clear in chapter 2.2.3 I do not go into these fields more closely though.

This perspective does not regard the group level. It draws connections to public discourses, but does not in general analyse the socio-cultural settings or wider migratory aspects. The description of socio-historic settings of the spaces concerned, though, requires methodological frameworks which can explain the structures of society and their implications in the situations of migration in the urban spaces analysed. One possibility in this case is the work of Assmann (mainly 1992), whose interest lies in the way in which collective culture and identity develop through collective memory. Hopper (2007) delivers a more global perspective on culture. This strategy is valid when considering broad social perspectives and power structures, although it might not be as useful when more individual structures of migrants build the focus of attention. Therefore works by scholars such as Geertz in his 1973 "Interpretation of cultures", Bakhtin in his 1981 "Dialogic imagination" or more recent approaches such as Bhabha "The Location of Culture" (1994) are important for the role of culture in the identity of migrants.

It is apparent that very few of the works reviewed give a coherent analysis of the diverse aspects of linguistic interaction and communication or form a cohesive survey of how these interrelate with the diverse aspects and factors on differing levels. Such a holistic approach is, however, very necessary if we want to try to answer the questions posed above (see 1.1) in an adequate manner.

What I intend to undertake, therefore, is an ecological linguistic analysis of interaction in urban space using a current theoretical perspective. Aspects such as language planning or environmental issues that can be part of ecolinguistics approaches, as for example in many of Mühlhäusler's works (e.g. "Linguistic ecology, language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region", 1996 or "Language of environment, environment of language, a course in ecolinguistics", 2003), are neglected here. Rather, an ecological linguistic approach in the way understood here affords methodological instruments for the corpus analysis, for example through such works as "The ecology of language evolution" (2001) and "Language evolution, contact, competition and change" (2008) by Salikoko Mufwene or "Explaining language change, an evolutionary approach" (2000) and "Typology and universals" (2003) by William Croft, as well as giving a holistic perspective on language.

## 1.3 Theoretical Considerations: the Linguistic Ecology Approach

This specific ecological linguistic approach refers to Ludwig/Mühlhäusler/Pagel (to be published) in an effort to find an approach which embraces and at the same time considers details and their diversity. The model which Ludwig/Mühlhäusler/Pagel develop postulates three levels – macro, meso and micro – as a framework for the consideration of factors on all three levels in the analysis of linguistic interaction. The model allows us to integrate various different aspects and factors into

the theoretical framework and at the same time into the scope of the investigation. It structures the various parts in a general frame, while simultaneously externalizing the relations between the different levels. Among the factors or parameters that can be taken into account through this approach are time spans, group sizes, origins, the receiving society/space, reasons for migration, age, networks and reference to/dependency on origin, attitudes developed towards and amongst migrants, attitudes towards perceived varieties and language usage, and modes of interaction. Thus social, political, historical, geographical, psychological, cultural, interactional, and variational-linguistic factors can all be considered. These diverse factors are organised into a socio-historic *macro* level including macro spaces: here socio-historic interconnections between spaces are analysed and the resulting socio-cultural settings of the societies are explored. Socio-cultural *meso* levels of reduced geographic size such as urban spaces and their settings follow, where the connections of urban space with its differentiated form, its society and its historically grown identity, as well as the specific connections with migration and migrant groups are highlighted. Finally we have situational discursive *micro* levels of specific interaction in which the actual language usage and communication of persons is compiled in a corpus and analysed taking all the other factors into account.

The model presented by Ludwig/Mühlhäusler/Pagel develops an abstract description of the relations between the different levels, but does not go into detail about the exact nature of these relationships. It explains the quality of the connections on a structural level, but does not give explanations of the how or why. Ludwig/Mühlhäusler/Pagel talk of "a complex open system of relations and dependencies" and of "multidimensional foundation relations" (31). An explicit explanation though, of what connects the different levels and how or why is not given. This work considers how different levels are related to each other and how these connections can be explained.

The relations between the different levels are, in my opinion, governed in this context by two important concepts: migration and identity. Migration as a movement, on a quite basic down-to-earth level, causes possible situations and promotes contact between people, spaces, languages and cultures, as well as between characteristics of identities. It brings the three levels present in the model into contact on the level of description and delivers a pool of possibilities made available by contact. Identity here is considered to be both an abstract concept and a dynamic process. It is constructed, founded and consolidated through the possibilities migration offers in each new situation of communication. Identity is one of the central aspects that pervades linguistic interaction. It explains how positioning oneself in relation to the persons involved and to the general context takes place. Migration and identity perpetuate a reciprocal interrelation in that migration creates the situations which construct the pool of possibilities migrants use in the process of identity construction. At the same time the situations migrants find themselves in through migration determine, at least in part, how this pool is referred to and thus how identity can be constructed.

In linguistic interaction particular factors in the situation have led scholars such as Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) to talk of acts of identity. Speakers produce and sustain their identity as individuals and as part of a group in the interaction. If language and identity are connected in this way, then the question in the case of migrants is whether different kinds of migration warrant different results in language usage. Are there any special communication viz. adaptation or distinction strategies that migrants assert in language usage? How do language and identity work together? Do migrants have a special identity?

Here, the migrants' origins – the Andean region – are similar in both cases, so that if they are incorporated into the identity, it should be possible to locate similarities. But the groups differ in total size and diversity in comparison to the receiving society. This could lead to different attitudes, both among migrants and the receiving society. Questions of integration and distinction in identity will play a role in both cases:

> "Different research traditions within sociocultural linguistics have particular strengths in analysing the varied dimensions of identity (…). The method of analysis selected by the researcher makes salient which aspect of identity comes into view, and such 'partial accounts' contribute to the broader understanding of identity that we advocate here. Although these lines of research have often remained separate from one another, the combination of their diverse theoretical and methodological strengths – including the microanalysis of conversation, the macro analysis of ideological processes, the quantitative and qualitative analysis of linguistic structures, and the ethnographic focus on local cultural practices and social groupings – calls attention to the fact that identity in all its complexity can never be contained within a single analysis. For this reason, it is necessary to conceive of sociocultural linguistics broadly and inclusively." (Bucholtz/Hall 2005, 607)

Everyday mobility produces contact situations between persons from different backgrounds in regard to their migration status, education, social class, employment etc. Such movement is given in all urban spaces. However, the dimensions of two other types of migration or movement are more specific to the urban space considered: that of national and international migration. In Lima we find both regional and national migration. As far as Latin America is concerned Madrid receives international, even intercontinental migration, but has also dealt with massive regional migration from all over Spain. International migration has implications for possible movement to and fro. The implications for culture and language are possibly not as great as in Lima, since there different languages with their corresponding cultures and identities meet within the same group of migrants. In this, we are only taking into account migration between Latin America and Spain. Otherwise, Madrid is just as diverse as Lima and even receives massive migration influx from a much wider geographical range than Lima does (Eastern Europe, Africa, Asia). So multilingual settings are the norm in both spaces analysed here.

Apart from the difference in migratory movements – Lima with heavy national migration and Madrid with both national and massive international migration – both

urban spaces display very different historic and socio-cultural settings. These result in quite diverse structures in society with distinct mentalities and approaches to migration and cultural collective identities. Despite this, both cities are linked historically by colonialism and contacts[5]. All these factors, similarities and differences, contacts and links as well as independent development, make it especially interesting to compare linguistic interaction of migrants moving between these spaces and their home region. Since linguistic interaction is both a result of expressed identity and an instrument of building and implementing identity, the repercussions of these multi-layered settings should be open to investigation through a detailed analysis of "real life" interaction.

## 1.4 Methodology: a Corpus based Approach

The description of such a complex situation needs to start on the micro level of linguistic interaction taking the other levels into account in the explanation of the facts perceived in these interactions. Such a description cannot take place on a purely abstract level. It requires the consideration of specific, real life interaction and therefore has to be based on the compilation and analysis of a corpus. As Gumperz (1971, 151) puts it:

> "The raw material for our study is the distribution of linguistic forms in everyday speech. As is usual in descriptive analysis, these forms are first described in terms of their own internal patterning at the various strata (phonemic, morphonemic, etc.) of linguistic structure. Ultimately, however, the results of this analysis will have to be related to social categories. (…) Since social interaction always takes place within particular groups, linguistic source data will have to be made commensurable with such groups."

The data needed to undertake the analysis of such linguistic interaction in everyday situations is best found by compiling audio corpora to use as databases. For example Ludwig et al. emphasise that "the speech situation, or the speakers' situated talk, must play a key role in linguistic analysis. Empirical data collecting and corpus analysis are the preferred methods of operation in ecological linguistics" (38). Such a corpus analysis facilitates movement on all three levels of analysis and makes it possible to analyse, interpret and understand informal everyday migrant conversation in urban space. That is, the methodology, combined with the theoretical approach, is most likely to make coherent analysis and interpretation of the data possible and facilitates abstraction of the results into general terms.

---

5   These settings will be analysed and interpreted in extenso throughout this work, but especially in chapters 3.2 and 4.2.

## 1.5 Implementation of Methodology and Theoretical Approach: The Main Parameters

How does linguistic interaction take place in migration and urban space? How is language used? To find out how language and its setting interplay in the individual's use of language, I will look at concrete language usage on the basis of the corpus and compare two different spaces, viz. the language use of migrants in the urban settings of Lima and Madrid. Why do I choose urban spaces and specifically migrants as one type of interlocutors in them?

Urbanity facilitates the coincidence of parameters – there is a great range of multi-levelled situations in a comparatively small space, we have many different linguistic varieties and corresponding varied situations of linguistic contact and many different social networks and socio-economic interdependencies exist. Urban spaces are known for their dynamic character and are representative for the kind of space in which a fast growing percentage of the worlds' population nowadays lives. They show how geographically widely spread spaces are interconnected through migration and the movement resulting from increasing globalisation. They are also the nexus of modern time and space forms with traditionally grown societies and identities. Thus, the urban setting and its corresponding parameters influence the corpus and analysed linguistic interaction.

Lima and Madrid are representative for big urban centres in Spanish speaking countries. Their specific setting in macro spaces, however, is very different. One reason for choosing Lima and Madrid as comparative spaces is their historic nature. Both urban spaces have undergone distinct socio-economic developments. The contrast evident in their constellation is easier to grasp than a confrontation of two other Spanish-speaking cities of this size might be. This is also due to their apparent unbroken historical colonial connection. They can now provide a rewarding field of research on migration from the Andean region. Of course, much of the ongoing interaction takes place in the current time. Each individual's everyday life and the course of his life, is embedded in the current state of affairs as far as urban space is concerned, as well as in the macro constellations of nations and globalisation.

Against the backdrop of globalisation the two urban spaces selected are representative for capitals of Spanish-speaking countries on two different continents, Madrid as the capital of Spain and former head of the colonies, Lima as capital of Peru and one of the oldest headquarters of the Spaniards in Latin America. Since the analysis and interpretation of this corpus is primarily a synchronic analysis, historic dimensions are only taken into account when they influence the current situation analysed. In both countries and cities Spanish is the official language and that most often spoken.

As I am comparing two corpora from migrants in two different receiving societies, but only comparing the corpora with language usage in these societies when it is necessary in order to be able to understand differences, questions are limited to these two groups and their synchronic comparison. I will analyse two audio corpora collected in fieldwork in Lima and Madrid in 2011, taking into account

the specific settings of the persons recorded. The outside parameters were chosen in such a way that comparability is given. Migrants from the Andes arrived in the two spaces considered here, Lima and Madrid, on different routes. The recorded persons all originate in the Andean region, are all young adults with a certain educational level (at least with a complete school education) and have been living in Lima respectively Madrid for at least a year, most of them for at least four years. The quantity of men and women analysed is more or less equal for both spaces and the situation during the recording was always an informal conversation between two and four persons, some of whom already knew each other, others who were introduced by friends. As researcher I was present in all cases and as such can be taken either as an element to be accommodated or just as a normal run of the mill person met by migrants in everyday life. Trudgill (1986, 6) comments on the bias of the investigator and the possible accommodation of speakers in the chosen register: "Certainly my own feeling concerning my survey of the English spoken in Norwich was that accommodation did indeed take place but that I accommodated linguistically to my informants rather than inducing them to accommodate to me." Urban spaces tend to accommodate people from all over so that it is quite normal for migrants to interact with someone from a different network. The migrants have to manage socialisation and various tasks of everyday life through means of linguistic interaction in this space. The various groups were generally recorded in two or three different parts of town, similar in their distribution of social class, so that several persons are from the same sort of background or everyday interactive space. The aim in compiling the data was not to make a quantitative analysis but rather a qualitative analysis. For this reason, the overall size of the groups was approximately 30 persons with about 55 hours of recordings. Between a third and half of this was transcribed and analysed, half each for Lima and Madrid.

As far as social diversity is concerned, we have to differentiate between the background of the migrants and their actual situation in the urban space. In Lima the overall scope in both regards is fairly wide. Migrants can be from economically very poor conditions as well as from rather well off rural families. Their grades of education differ depending on their socio-economical background and so does their work situation. The tendency in general, however, is that the situation in both work and living conditions is comparatively worse in the urban space. People tend to have difficulties finding a job in their trained professions. On the other hand the opposite is just as possible as we will see, for example in the Ministry of Education. Social prestige in everyday public life, however, is not necessarily congruent with this and tends to be rather low for migrants from more rural parts of Peru. In Madrid migrants tend not to have such massive problems with social prestige and standing since the surrounding society exhibits a different mentality and identity. But the economic and work situation tends to be far below the grade of education originally received in their home countries.

Against this backdrop, considering only the migratory flows of Spanish-speaking persons alone (whether monolingual or bilingual) is of enough interest.

Is language usage among migrants from the Andean region in Lima the same as it is among migrants from the Andean region in Madrid or does it differ? What are the differences or similarities in the situations as well as in concrete linguistic interaction? If there are differences, what are they owed to? What provokes them? Is it typological difference in types of migration? Or the varying context of the urban space migrated to? Is it possibly the differing backgrounds of migrants?

In both cases I consider Spanish communication. The question is, do the varied situations and the contact situations including different varieties have any influence on the way language is used?

Looking at the way people use language when two or more varieties of basically the same historically grown language are involved, provides very interesting and minute data. In Lima we have contact situations between Andean highland varieties and coastal varieties as well as influences from indigenous languages such as Quechua. In Madrid the whole range of Andean varieties, including some from Lima, meets peninsular Spanish and especially Madrileño varieties. Language learning varieties are only marginally involved since in general both the Peruvian and the peninsular varieties are mutually intelligible and speakers are proficient in at least one of them.

What we are concerned with here then, is mostly called dialect contact, for example according to Trudgill (1986) or Auer/Hinskens/Kerswill (2005). Since the approach taken here towards language is that of an open dynamic system, I will mainly speak of language use and refer to varieties, not dialects, when it is necessary to refer to a linguistic entity, for example for the sake of comparison. The contact situations regarded here between migrants in urban spaces are then considered to be spaces of linguistic interaction, in which language use is subject to open, dynamic processes of negotiation of contents and identity. Trudgill (1986, 1) specifies that

> "In this type of contact situation, many of the linguistic developments that may take place are not strictly speaking necessary from a purely communicative point of view, although of course comprehension difficulties may occur. Nevertheless, it can readily be observed that related, mutually intelligible dialects do have an effect on one another in contact situations, with or without the development of individual bidialectalism. Very often, for example, when two speakers of different varieties of the same language which are completely mutually intelligible come into contact and converse, items may be transferred from one of the varieties to the other."

## 1.6 Contact

What this actually means and how it is contrived in actual interaction is one of the questions considered here. Since the linguistic varieties in contact are typologically similar, understanding is not usually a problem in the first place. So issues of awareness, attitude and similar subtle nuances in speech which language learners cannot take in, could be of importance instead.

The contact under examination is distinguished by its minute and detailed differences which do not cause massive problems in understanding. Indeed, seen in connection with the social space and the surroundings this contact occurs in, the nuances and differences that are not striking at first become all the more interesting for our understanding of communication.

What exactly takes place in the situation of contact is the next logical question. How do migrants undertake communication in interaction? Considering the data and scenarios, it appears that migrants make adjustments in accordance with the specific situation they find themselves in. Possible factors are the awareness of certain situations or of specific linguistic features and their connection with particular attitudes. Cognitive factors can also play a role in this context. Trudgill (1986, 1) refers to influence and interference as one possibility:

> "The presence, then, of two or more varieties within the repertoires of single speakers leads to influence and interaction, some of it of the type often labelled 'interference'. The languages that are in contact with each other socially may become changed linguistically, as a result of also being in contact psychologically, in the competences of individual speakers."

This statement indicates that different levels in language are concerned. Linguistic interaction necessitates action on the cognitive, the pragmatic-discursive and the situational-social level, three levels that therefore need to be included in the analysis of linguistic data.

## 1.7  Linguistic Parameters

We have established that language and its context as well as the intentions of the speaker in his acts of identity, are closely connected. What is not yet clear, is how language is sensitive to the aforementioned facts. Therefore another important question for our analysis is which parts of language are affected by contact situations such as the ones investigated here. Givón (1995, 15) estimates these aspects thus:

> "Once one begins to examine the distribution and use of grammatical structure in its communicative context, the overwhelming deployment of grammar to code discourse coherence is obvious. The most discourse-pragmatically oriented grammatical systems:
>
> a. Grammatical roles of subject and direct object
> b. Definiteness and reference
> c. Anaphora, pronouns and agreement
> d. Tense-aspect-modality and negation
> e. Voice and topicalization
> f. Focusing and relativization
> g. Speech acts
> h. Clausal conjunction and subordination."

Some of the structures named by Givón, will also be the subject of analysis in this work (see e.g. 3.3.3 ff. and 4.3.3 ff.). What becomes apparent is that language has different levels, which I distinguish as cognitive, pragmatic-discursive and situational-social. In order to achieve a good survey of the parts of language that play a role, the analysis must take these into account. It can then show us, for example, when language is sensitive to processes of identity constitution in urban migration situations.

How or why are these areas especially affected? Will they lead us to examine what mechanisms and strategies lie behind these language uses? How does the context etc. influence interaction and bring about the functions we find in the analysis? As Gumperz (1971, 225) puts it: "One of (the speakers) first steps is to determine what, if any, limitations the environment imposes on his choice of inter-actional strategies." What are the concrete perceivable happenings? What are the results in language usage and discourse? How do cognitive factors play a role in the process? Do awareness and perception have any influence on the way language is used? Are the results dependent on differences in the culture and identity of the space in which the speakers find themselves?

In the midst of various different traditional approaches in linguistics such as dialectology, language contact, pragmatics and grammar, discourse analysis and sociolinguistics, this work combines a multifactorial analysis with a methodological and theoretical approach, which encompasses all these and reflects the ecological principal at its roots.

## 1.8 Structure

Consequently I shall structure this work as follows: first I will give a detailed insight into the theoretical approach developed (see 2.). I shall explain the linguistic approach in combination with socio-cultural parameters on the three levels macro, meso and micro. This combines methodological explanations for the socio-historical settings of the macro and meso space, that is the setting of migrants from the Andes in the urban spaces of Lima and Madrid, with linguistic methodological instruments for the analysis and understanding of the corpus data. These instruments are then applied to explain in more detail the specific contexts of the urban spaces with individual chapters on Lima and Madrid (see 3. and 4.). These show how urbanity is historically constituted and reflected in the structure of the cities. I consider the types of society which have developed in these spaces, and how their contact through migration evolves, and finally I explain the specific groups involved in the corpus. As a next step the two corpora are analysed separately: the cognitive, pragmatic-discursive, social-situational aspects, as the three main levels that influence language use, are subdivided into chapters that have their basis in the concrete linguistic and communicative mechanisms through which specific features are chosen in interaction. In the cognitive realm the linguistic mechanisms are markedness and simplification, salience and awareness; in the pragmatic-discursive realm they are focussing and formation of relief, and

also expressiveness; and in the social-situational realm, adapting, attitude and avoiding. I attribute these mechanisms to the particular grammatical, as well as lexical and discursive categories involved, according to which of them is mainly represented and active in the category (see 3.3.2 and 4.3.2). Of course, all categories have links to almost all mechanisms. This order was chosen to avoid, as far as possible, repetition of information and of examples while at the same time giving the analysis a congruent framework within the general theoretical approach. Nevertheless, repetitions cannot be completely avoided and the interconnections of different levels and aspects of language are therefore deliberately pooled in a specific chapter on connectives and text structuring, in order to show how the various aspects can work together (see 3.3.5 and 4.3.5). The first analysis is of the corpus from Lima as part of the Andean region. Then the corpus from Madrid as European counterpart to the corpus from Lima will be investigated in the same way. These two analyses merge in a comparative analysis to locate similarities and differences in the language use of migrants from the same geographic region in their separate contexts in Lima and Madrid (see 5.). My final task is to combine the socio-historic with the linguistic analysis to form an overall picture of possible hows and whys from the results of the analysis, and of language usage in varied urban spaces and their specific identities, socio-historic and cultural settings (see 6.). My conclusions and suggestions for ongoing investigative perspectives round up the picture (see 7.).