**The Effects of Gender and Age on
Spanish and English in Contact**
Daniel J. Smith
Clemson University

Hipertexto

Bilingual language contact involves the juxtaposition of different lexical and grammatical systems along with speakers' varying social backgrounds. This study[1] treats a recent language contact situation in a Hispanic speech community in Northeast Georgia (U.S.A.), a good site to observe speakers' use of English and Spanish in contact.

Gardner-Chloros (1995:86) stated, regarding bilingual speech, that "the description of both inter- and intra-individual variation in the same communities has hardly even begun." This study examines variation across a range of speakers in a community and is a study of the relationship of gender and age and related social factors to grammatical patterns. Gardner-Chloros also points out that social factors are at least as influential as bilingual proficiency in the types of codeswitching (CS) used by speakers. Like Labov (1972a, b), who showed the importance of gender in accounting for linguistic variables and language change, Jacobson (1990:7) recognized that gender and age should be a part of the sociolinguistic study of CS apart from socio-economic status alone. Gender and age are examined together with the different types of monolingual and bilingual language patterns observed from a group of speakers in the community under study here. Employment, time spent in the U.S., and number of years in school are also considered. Age differences in this study can also account for

---

[1] This study and the data corpus under study are drawn from a larger study, Smith (2002). Smith (2004a, 2004b, 2005) are three studies also drawn from the same larger study and data corpus.

generational differences, since all participants are either children or adults, with no child participant over 13 years old or adult participant under 20 years old.

Community characteristics

Hispanics began coming in the late 1980's to Habersham County, Georgia, and parts of two bordering counties (Banks and Stephens). Since that time this community has flourished.   The majority of the community of the study and the participants studied are from Mexico; some are from Central and South America and the Caribbean. The larger English-speaking community generally consider them to be one group and refer to them as either Hispanics or Mexicans. Mexican and Central American immigrants tend to be from lower socio-economic groups upon their arrival in the U.S. than those from the Caribbean or South America. Spanish is the principal language of this Hispanic community, and for children whose main language is already English, older members of their families use Spanish with other members of the Hispanic community.

Adult Guatemalan immigrants, whose home language is usually Q'anjob'al Maya,[2] also interact mainly in Spanish with non-Guatemalan Hispanics.

Most of the adults do manual work such as in factories or construction. Some, however, usually from South America or the Caribbean, have ministerial or service jobs such as pastors, teachers or teacher assistants in the schools.

All of the children have studied in English-dominant schools.   The adults have varying degrees of formal training in English, usually not that very much except for sometimes a brief exposure to English in their country of origin in schools, and sometimes sporadic English classes in the U.S.

The participants of this speech community were selected from male and female children and adults, all living in varying degrees of Spanish contact with English within the larger English-dominant community.

Community language and social data gathering procedures

Audio recorded and transcribed conversational data were gathered from 26 adults (12 males and 14 females, between the ages of 20 and 65) in homes, in church, and in classes of English as a second language, and from 30 children (16 males and 14 females, between the ages of 7 and 13) in school, home, church, and recreational settings. The study participants were recorded in ordinary conversational settings.

Social information, including age, gender, employment, schooling, and years spent in the U.S., was obtained from a questionnaire administered either orally or in written form to each of the participants.

Language types in the data

Codeswitching (CS) is defined as in Myers-Scotton (1993[1997], 2002) and is here used to refer to the use of words or morphemes[3] from more than one language, in this case

---

[2] Q'anjob'al, one of the Mayan languages, is spoken primarily in the Huehuetenango Department of Guatemala and also part of Mexico. All the Q'anjob'al speakers participating in this study were from Huehuetenango in Guatemala.

[3] Usually a whole word is inserted. Occasionally, however, a morpheme is inserted into a sentence, bound to one or more morphemes (e.g. suffix) of the other language as in a sentence the researcher observed a study participant using in a phone conversation: *Te voy a _send_-er un _e-mail_.* 'I am going to

Spanish and English, in the same sentence or between sentences inside a conversational turn. CS can therefore include switching languages between sentences or the alternation of one language with another within and between sentences and the insertion of single morphemes or whole words into a sentence of the other language.

Convergence here refers to grammatical convergence by which we mean the use of a sequence of morphemes or words from one language with some grammatical structure from another language. In the community of this study the two participating languages are Spanish and English. Convergence is defined as in Myers-Scotton (2002). What some researchers call syntactic or grammatical interference or transfer is what leads to long term convergence, so we are not distinguishing between convergence and interference or transfer. Whether or not convergence becomes a permanent part of a speaker's or community's grammar or if it is a phase through which speakers pass on the way to language proficiency in their second language (L2) or on the way to language shift is not for us to say with certainty. It is well-known, however, that grammatical convergence can fossilize and become a part of the permanent part of a speaker's grammar, and, if enough speakers fossilize, can lead to major language change in the form of pidgins and then creoles (See Myers-Scotton 2002.).

Example 1 illustrates convergence, the use of all Spanish morphemes with grammatical structure from both English and Spanish. English makes minimal use of verb endings, only distinguishing the third person singular from the other persons in the present tense by the addition of an *-s* morpheme. Spanish distinguishes all three persons and numbers with six different verb endings in the present tense. The same verb form used for the English infinitive *go* is the one used for all the present verb forms with the exception of the third person singular present. Therefore, it stands to reason that this verb system strategy in English has transferred to Spanish, creating a case of convergence in *yo ir primero* in example 1. The second turn of example (1), *yo he gané*, is another example of convergence because in the simple past *gané* has replaced the past participle *ganado*, probably due to the fact that the simple past and past participle in English are frequently the same form, *won*. Therefore *gané* has become confused with *ganado*.

(1)AZ and JZ are brothers whose parents are from Peru. They attend an all English private school where they have little contact with other Hispanic children, as compared to the majority of Hispanic children in the community who attend schools with large numbers of other Hispanic children. AZ is ten years old. JZ is eight years old. In the following conversation excerpt these two brothers are playing a game of marbles. (unsorted transcript, p. 91).

> AZ: Ok, **yo ir** primero. ¡Entonces se va a matar!
>   Ok, yo ir primero
>   Ok, I go(infinitive) first

---

send you an e-mail.' In this sentence the English morpheme *send* is inserted into the all Spanish sentence with the exception of another inserted whole word *e-mail*. The *–er* Spanish infinitive ending is added to the English morpheme *send* making a new codeswitched whole word *send-er* 'to send' with a morpheme from English and a morpheme complex (in *–er* , *-e* indicates verb class and *–r* indicates infinitive) suffix from Spanish.

```
Standard Spanish:  Ok, yo      voy                    primero
                   Ok, I       go-1SG.PRES            first
                   'Ok, I go first. Then/So he/it is going to get killed!'

JZ:    Yo **he gané.**
       Yo    he    gané
       I     have  won

       Standard Spanish:    Yo    he    ganado
                            I     have  won-PAST PART
       'I have won.'
```

The data are analyzed within Myers-Scotton's (1993 [1997]) Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model. The MLF model assumes that one language, the matrix language, provides the frame into which morphemes, words, or word strings from the other language, the embedded language, may be inserted. If a language switch is made at sentence boundaries where one language alternates with the other in whole sentences, then one matrix frame is switched to the other language frame with no insertions of the embedded language**.** CS is the result of switching between frames or the embedding of one language into the matrix language frame of the other language. Convergence is a result of combining grammatical structure from both languages in a sentence so that the matrix language frame of that sentence is a composite frame with grammatical elements from both languages (Myers-Scotton 2002).

Patterns of CS and convergence in the transcribed data for each study participant were determined. The following language patterns were found in the data (See Table 1 for examples and further explanation of each pattern; each pattern is assigned a label or name for ease of reference in the rest of the paper.): (1)monolingual Spanish with no CS or convergence (name – **S**); (2)monolingual English with no CS or convergence (name – **E**); (3)Spanish with single English morpheme insertions (name – **E>Sinsert**); (4)English with single Spanish morpheme insertions (name – **S>Einsert**); (5)intersentential English/Spanish CS or CS between sentences (name – **SEinter**); (6)intrasentential English/Spanish CS or CS within a sentence but with multi-word strings of each language within the same sentence (name – **SEintra**); (7)Spanish morpheme strings with grammatical structure from English (convergence) (name – **S>Econv**); and (8)English morpheme strings with grammatical structure from Spanish (convergence) (name – **E>Sconv**).[4]

Each turn in the transcripts was analyzed and categorized as one of the eight language types. Each sentence in longer turns was counted separately as an instance of its pattern type. In the analysis, a turn consisting of an utterance, even if not a complete sentence because of the lack of an overt conjugated verb, was considered a sentence because a conjugated verb can be understood even if suppressed in phonological representation. Example 2 illustrates this; the turn *thunder and truenos* 'thunder and thunder', in which the Spanish word *truenos* 'thunder' has been inserted

---

[4] S>Econv and E>Sconv may also have possible influence from Q'anjob'al, but only for Guatemalan participants (N=4) (cf. Table 1).

into an English frame (S>Einsert), can be understood to be an abbreviated form of *You say thunder and truenos* or *It is thunder and truenos*.

(2)   A, B, C, and D are interlocutors in a conversation. A is an adult and the rest are children (unsorted transcript, p. 41).

> A: *Ok, ¿Como se dice?, (name)?* ('Ok, how do you say?, (name)?')
> B: (whispering, speech is unintelligible)
> A: *¿Como se dice? Ok.* ('How do you say? Ok.'*)*
> C: thunder
> D: thunder, and *truenos*   ('thunder, and thunder')
> A: Uh
> B: thunder and *truenos* ('thunder and thunder')

Therefore, when 'sentence' is used to describe turn analysis, this type turn, as illustrated in example 2 above, is also considered to be a 'sentence'.

Table 1 Language types identified in the data (continues in the following page)

Language type name	Other names/references used for language type	Language type explanation	Language type example
S	Spanish; all/only Spanish; monolingual Spanish	Spanish morpheme strings with no CS and with Spanish morpho-syntactic structure	<u>¿Y tenemos que colorear todo igualito y el palo y todo ese igualito del palo?</u> 'And we have to color everything the same and the stick and all that the same as the stick?' (16[a]-chF[b])
E	English; all/only English; monolingual English	English morpheme strings with no CS and with English morpho-syntactic structure	He can even see him. (16-chF)
E>Sinsert	CS; morpheme mixing; bilingual	Spanish sentence with single English morpheme insertion (excluding proper names)	<u>Estoy grabando al</u> baby. 'I'm recording the baby.' (38-adF)
S>Einsert	CS; morpheme mixing; bilingual	English sentence with single Spanish morpheme insertion (excluding proper names)	thunder and <u>truenos</u> 'thunder and thunder' (24-chM)
Seinter	CS; morpheme mixing; bilingual	Intersentential English/Spanish CS (switches at sentence boundaries)	Nuh-uh, I haven't. <u>Necesitamos todos, todos, todos.</u> 'We need all of them, all of them, all of them.' (32-chF)
Seintra	CS; morpheme mixing; bilingual	Intrasentential English/Spanish CS (more than one word insertions within a sentence)	<u>No está aquí, está en</u> Houston I think. 'It isn't here; it's in Houston I think.' (4-chM)
S>Econv	(grammatical) convergence; bilingual	Spanish morpheme strings with grammatical convergence of Spanish and English (also possible influence from Q'anjob'al but only from Guatemalan participants (N=4))	<u>Yo he gané.</u> 'I have won.' (64-chM) (standard Spanish, *'Yo he ganado.'*)

| E>Sconv | (grammatical) convergence; bilingual | English morpheme strings with grammatical convergence of Spanish and English (also possible influence from Q'anjob'al but only from Guatemalan participants (N=4)) | See, I put some **dots red**. 'See, I put some red dots.' (Spanish: 'círculos rojos' (lit.: 'dots red')) (16-chF)
I **no can** see. 'I can't see.' (Spanish: 'no puedo' (lit.: 'no can')) (23-chF) |

[a] numbers assigned to identify participants in the data transcript
[b] ch=child, ad=adult, M=male, F=female

Gender and age correlated with language types

Gender and age are correlated with language pattern types found in the data. In order to see the relationship of gender and age to the linguistic data, the number of 'certain' instances of each language type were counted for each participant, and participants were categorized by gender and age and other social factors through surveys and interviews. 'Certain' instances of each language type denote those that were categorized without doubts. There were sometimes 'uncertain' instances that could not be categorized with certainty regarding language type usually due to imperfect recording conditions. Only certain instances were included in the data in this paper, including the average percentages. Percentages of each language type per participant were calculated. The average percentage of each language type was calculated for the total number of participants in each gender/age group, as seen in Table 2. Since only 'certain' instances were counted, the percentages do not add up to 100%. The missing percentages are accounted for by the uncertain instances.

In Table 2, two numbers accompanied by the same letter indicate that the difference between the average language type percentages represented by those two numbers is statistically significant at the .05 level using a t-Test. Table 3 shows the 'p values' for the statistical tests of significant difference between each gender/age group for each language type.

Table 2 Gender/age and language type
Note for this and following tables: F=female, M=male; numbers after F or M indicate the age range in years of participants in that category; N=number of participants in that category.

Gender/Age	Language Type							
	S	E	E>S insert	S>E insert	SE inter	SE intra	S>E conv	E>S conv
F7-13(yrs. old) (N=14)	48.7 a, b	20.3 e	9.1 h, i	0.8	2.7 j	3.8	2.6 k	2.8
F20-65 (N=14)	70.4 a, c	8.9 f	3.5	0.1	3	1.4	0.1 k	3.5
M7-13 (N=16)	47.5 c, d	32.3 f, g	2.7 i	0.4	1.1	4.5	3.1	2.2
M20-65 (N=12)	85.7 b, d	3.5 e, g	2.3 h	0	0.2 j	1	0.9	1.2

Table 3 'p values' for the statistical tests of difference between gender/age groups for each language type
Test: "t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances"
'p values' are the values for "P(T<=t) two-tail"
* significant differences at the .05 level

Gender/Age	Language Types							
Comparisons	S	E	E>Sinsert	S>Einsert	Seinter	SEintra	S>Econv	E>Sconv
F7-13, M7-13	0.896629	0.166412	*0.045342	0.647153	0.133869	0.744874	0.812491	0.697418
F7-13, F20-65	*0.025004	0.071019	0.07303	0.391199	0.862789	0.145372	*0.038171	0.793988
F7-13, M20-65	*0.0000173	*0.002553	*0.035689	0.290039	*0.021334	0.100369	0.17602	0.243347
M7-13, M20-65	*0.000149	*0.001078	0.781476	0.068632	0.053166	0.06731	0.223764	0.463192
M7-13, F20-65	*0.034458	*0.008885	0.562805	0.276519	0.180052	0.09514	0.088638	0.633315
F20-65, M20-65	0.076205	0.23328	0.401018	0.335561	0.052537	0.739262	0.131845	0.384964

significant at the .05 level: F7-13 and F20-65; F7-13 and M20-65; M7-13 and M20-

Monolingual Spanish (S) and monolingual English (E)

Table 2 indicates that monolingual Spanish (S) and monolingual English (E) are the most frequent language types found in the data. Monolingual Spanish is much more frequent than monolingual English, since it is the first language (L1) of the community under study. No percentage of monolingual English or any of the bilingual mixing types (CS and convergence) approaches the much higher percentages of monolingual Spanish use by all age and gender groups. Some of the bilingual mixing types are used more, however, by some participants than monolingual English is used by others. For example, younger females use a higher percentage (9.1%) of E>Sinsert, one type of CS, than older female and male adults use monolingual English. Female adults use 8.9% monolingual English and male adults use only 3.5% monolingual English.

As shown in Table 2, both younger males and younger females use lower average percentages of monolingual Spanish (S) than older males or older females. The average S percentage differences between the following gender and age groups are statistically 65; M7-13 and F20-65. Age, therefore, shows significant correlation to S usage. But gender differences within the same age group are not significant for S usage.

Likewise, both older males and females show lower average percentages of monolingual English (E) than both younger males and females. Children show lower average S percentages and higher E percentages. The average E percentage differences between the following gender and age groups are statistically significant at the .05 level: F7-13 and M20-65; M7-13 and M20-65; M7-13 and F20-65. Again, age difference characterizes every significant E usage difference, but never gender alone.

Single word insertions

Also Table 2 shows that female children have the highest average percentage of usage of English sentences with single Spanish word insertions (E>Sinsert). The average E>Sinsert percentage differences between the following gender and age

groups are statistically significant at the .05 level: F7-13 and M7-13; F7-13 and M20-65. Not only age but also gender correlates significantly with a difference in the frequency of insertion of single English morphemes into Spanish sentences. The E>Sinsert difference between younger females and males, however, is the only significant gender/age difference that shows a difference in gender which does not also show a difference in age. Example 3 illustrates the high frequency of E>Sinsert in the speech of a younger female participant.

(3)   JR= 40 (sorted transcript, pp.64-65).[5]
JR: *Esta señorita está muy bien en su* **Reading**. *Y en todo en su* **Math** *y en todo en su* **Reading, Reading,** *y* **Reading, all the time in Reading, Reading, OK**? *Y está muy bien en* **Reading, Reading**!
'This girl is very good in her Reading. And in all in her Math and in all in   her   Reading, Reading, and Reading, all the time in Reading, Reading, OK? And she's very good in Reading, Reading!'
…………………………………………
JR: *Porque está* (name). *(unintelligible Spanish) quedar porque uh uh sólo no estaba leyendo la el* **reading** *cuando estaba* **clicking**. *(unintelligible Spanish) saco treinta y cinco (unintelligible Spanish) no estaba leyendo sólo estaba jugando, estaba* **clicking** *sólo lo que quería.*
'Because (name) is. (unintelligible Spanish) to stay because uh uh he wasn't just reading the the reading when he was clicking. (unintelligible Spanish) I take out thirty five (unintelligible Spanish) he wasn't reading he was just playing, he was clicking   just   what he wanted to.'

García (1980), Lindholm and Padilla (1978), and Poplack (1983) found that single morpheme insertions outrank other types of CS in children's versus adults' language samples. By contrast, in this data corpus, while adults use fewer Spanish words inserted into English sentences (S>Einsert) than children of either gender, adult females outrank male children in E>Sinsert usage even though this difference is not statistically significant. The female children, however, outrank all other gender/age groups by almost three to one in E>Sinsert. Also, since there is no significant difference between younger and older females in E>Sinsert and there is a significant difference between younger females and both male groups, females in general outrank males in percentage of E>Sinsert.

Combined codeswitching types
    In Table 4 (as in Table 2) two numbers accompanied by the same letter indicate that the difference between the average language type percentages represented by those two numbers is statistically significant at the .05 level. Table 5 (as in Table 3) shows the 'p values' for the statistical tests of significant difference between each gender/age group for combined codeswitching (CS) types.
    When percentages of all CS types (E>Sinsert, S>Einsert, SEinter, and SEintra) are combined, as shown in Table 4, there are statistically significant differences at the .05 level between younger and older males and between younger females and older

---

[5] Study participants are identified with initials and unique identification numbers; 'sorted' and 'unsorted' transcript' are the data transcripts from which examples are drawn.

males. No significant differences were found for combined CS types percentages between any of the other gender/age groups.

Table 4 Gender/age and combined CS types

Gender/Age	Combined CS types--%
F7-13 (N=14)	16.4 a
F20-65 (N=14)	8
M7-13 (N=16)	8.7 b
M20-65 (N=12)	3.4 a, b

Table 5 'p values' for the statistical tests of difference between gender/age groups for combined CS types
Test: "t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances"
'p values' are the values for "P(T<=t) two-tail"
* significant differences at the .05 level

Gender/Age Comparisons	Combined CS Types
F7-13, M7-13	0.120342
F7-13, F20-65	0.092032
F7-13, M20-65	*0.012807
M7-13, M20-65	*0.044064
M7-13, F20-65	0.788756
F20-65, M20-65	0.076217

When the CS types were tested separately, no significant differences were found at all between younger and older males. The finding that CS types in general are significantly different, however, widens the CS distinction by age, since not only younger females but also younger males codeswitch significantly more than older males.

Older females' combined CS types are not significantly different from any other gender group, even though both younger males and younger females have combined CS types significantly higher than older males. Recall that in Table 2 the data show that E>Sinsert is significantly higher for younger females than for younger males. Regarding CS types, these findings together show that younger and older females do not differ significantly, but younger and older males do. They also show that older males and females do not differ significantly but that younger males and females do (E>Sinsert). Therefore, either younger age or female gender and especially the two factors combined are the age/gender factors in our data most associated with significantly more CS usage.

Convergence

Tables 2 and 4 illustrate that female gender and/or young age are characteristics of the most frequent users of all the other bilingual language types. The tables show that older males demonstrated lowest usage of all the bilingual types and monolingual English utterances, with the exception of S>Econv (Spanish morpheme strings with

grammatical structure from English). For this language type, younger and older males together show a higher frequency of use than younger and older females together. Only younger females, however, show a significantly higher frequency of S>Econv and only over older females, who show the least S>Econv. Therefore, especially younger age but also to an extent male gender may be more characteristic of more frequent use of S>Econv. This pattern is an exception to the otherwise more prevalent general trend of either female gender or younger age as the factors most associated with English and bilingual language type usage, especially since there are more significant differences between younger females and all other gender groups. The S>Econv pattern may also bear some relation to the fact that younger males show the least S and the most E, frequencies that are significantly different from some of the other gender/age groups.

It is true that only younger males in the community were observed to converge (S>Econv) extensively, including two boys in the data corpus and two boys not represented in the data. The reason for their extensive convergence was probably their relative isolation from the majority of the Spanish-speaking community. The two Peruvian boys in the data corpus had lived and attended school in an outlying area of the community where few other Hispanics lived. They subsequently moved to another area of north Georgia where Hispanics were heavily concentrated but continued to live in a neighborhood with very few Hispanics and attended a private church school with very few Hispanics. Less is known about the two Mexican boys not in the data corpus, but they were not living in the community under study very long. All four boys had assimilated more into the American culture than most of the other participants in the study.

Older males showed slightly more S>Econv than older females, but the differences between female and male frequencies of S>Econv usage, however, are fewer than the differences between older and younger frequencies of S>Econv usage. These differences are again reflective of significantly different frequencies of S, E, E>Sinsert, and SEinter, which pattern similarly and which are also related more to age than to gender.

Female gender is even more characteristic than male gender or younger age of the users of the opposite type of convergence, E>Sconv (English morpheme strings with grammatical structure from Spanish). Even though older females show a significantly lower frequency of E usage than younger males, they show the highest frequency of E>Sconv. Though E>Sconv differences are not statistically significant, higher average E>Sconv usage by older females is perhaps due to the fact that they attempt to use English more than their older male peers, although with less control of English grammatical patterns than younger speakers.

Age differences

Table 2 shows that age and gender correlate with language type use. Children tend to use more English and bilingual types than adults, and females tend to use more English and bilingual types than males. Age is a stronger factor than gender in these language use differences, however, because there are more significant differences between ages than between genders only, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6 Language type percentages from Table 2 with significant differences between groups distinguished by differences in <u>Age only</u>, both <u>Age and Gender</u>, and <u>Gender only</u>.
Note: the letters a – i refer to the significant differences from Table 2.

Age only	Age and Gender	Gender only
S (a) S (d) E (g) S>Econv (k)	S (b) S (c) E (e) E (f) E>Sinsert (h) SEintra (j)	E>Sinsert (i)

Also, the great majority of the data, types S and E, divide much more clearly by age than by gender, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Language type S and E percentages from Table 2

	S (monolingual Spanish), 61.6% of the total data corpus	E (monolingualEnglish), 18.2% of the total data corpus
younger females	48.7% S	20.3% E
younger males	47.5% S	32.3% E
older females	70.4% S	8.9% E
older males	85.7% S	3.5% E

Since the ages of the study participants divide them into two age groups, children and adults, with no young people transitioning between being children and adults in the study, the age differences are comparable with studies on generational differences (e.g. Silva-Corvalán 1994). This study is different, however, from many other studies, for example those focusing on the southwestern U.S. where Spanish speakers are more bilingual or even more English-dominant, some of whose families have been in the U.S. for more than two generations. Almost all the adults in this study were born outside the U.S., and all had at least spent large parts of their lives in Latin America. Many more of the children but still less than half were born in the U.S.

Poplack (1982) showed that U.S. first generation Hispanics were usually less fluent in English than second or more generation U.S. Hispanics and that they also codeswitched much less frequently than second or more generation U.S. Hispanics. This is evident in the generational divide between adults and children of this study. Many more of the children were born in the U.S. than the adults and therefore represent second generation U.S. Hispanics. They also clearly use more English and codeswitch and converge more than the adults.

Younger age (7-13 year olds) is related to higher English and English-related uses primarily because children in this age range are exposed regularly to great quantities of English in English-dominant schools. They have English-speaking teachers and predominantly English-speaking classmates with whom they interact in English several hours each weekday. English is also the language of greater prestige in the community.   Hudson-Edwards and Bills (1982) claim a similar situation for a Spanish/English bilingual community in which English is the prestige language and younger participants used more English than older participants. Gal's (1979) study of

Hungarian/German bilingualism also showed that the younger participants used more of the overtly prestigious language, German, than did the older participants. But age alone does not explain all the differences in language usage. Gender and related social factors must also be examined.

Gender differences and other underlying social factors

In the data of our study younger males show the highest E usage, significantly higher than any other gender/age group except younger females (see Table 2). S and E usage differences are greater between younger and older males than between younger and older females. Younger and older males show a significant difference in E usage, and younger and older females do not. Younger and older female S and E usage is more similar than younger and older male S and E usage. In other words, older females show S and E patterns more like those of younger speakers than do older males. Therefore, even though there is more correlation of S and E usage to age, gender and factors related to gender are important to consider as well.

Younger males also have the highest average percentage of SEintra and S>Econv. Like older males, however, younger males show a lower average percentage of all combined CS and convergence types than their female peers. So while younger females do not lead their male peers in use of every individual bilingual language type, they do lead this group when all bilingual language types are considered together.

As mentioned previously, age is a factor in more significant differences than gender (see Table 6). Nevertheless, of the four bilingual type significant differences, three show differences between males and females. Only one (S>Econv) shows a difference in age only. Another one, E>Sinsert, a difference between younger males and females (see Table 6), shows a difference based on gender alone. Therefore, the only significantly different category between males and females without the additional factor of a difference in age is in CS use in which females codeswitch significantly more than males. Younger males use significantly more English than older females and mix Spanish and English significantly less than younger females.

Since together with younger males, older males also use a lower percentage of bilingual types, males in general mix languages less, but younger males use the most unmixed English (E) of all groups and still use fewer of the bilingual types than females in general. Therefore, males as a group tend to keep the two languages separate more than females.

Milroy and Li Wei (1995:155) conclude that gender, age, and employment need to be considered together with social network as factors that influence CS. Information regarding employment (Table 8), years in the U.S. (Table 9), and years in school (Tables 10 and 11) may indicate possible reasons for more use of English among adult females than adult males.

Table 8 Self employment of adults (continues in the following page)

Employment of self	Female Participants 20-65 yrs. old	Male Participants 20-65 yrs. old	Total for each category of employment
chicken processing plant	4	1	5
other factory	1	6	7
Store	1	1	2

Employment of self	Female Participants 20-65 yrs. old	Male Participants 20-65 yrs. old	Total for each category of employment
yard work		1	1
auto mechanic		1	1
Secretarial assistant	1		1
teaching assistant	1		1
Teacher	2		2
Pastor		1	1
Economist (in Peru)	1		1
full time student	1		1
Housewife	2		2
Retired		1	1
Total	**14**	**12**	**26**

Table 9 Years in U.S.

Gender/Age Category	0--2 yrs in U.S.	3--4 yrs in U.S.	5--6 yrs in U.S.	7--10 yrs in U.S.	10+ yrs in U.S.	Totals
Females 20-65 yrs	3	3	4	2	2	**14**
Males 20-65 yrs	2	4	2	1	3	**12**
Total	**5**	**7**	**6**	**3**	**5**	**26**

Table 10 Years of school in country of origin

Gender/Age Category	0 yrs	0+--2 yrs	3--4 yrs	5--7 yrs	8--10 yrs	11+ yrs	No response	Totals
Females 20-65 yrs					3	11		**14**
Males 20-65 yrs	1			2	6	1	2	**12**
Total	**1**			**2**	**9**	**12**	**2**	**26**

Table 11 Years of school in U.S.

Gender/ Age Category	0 yrs	0+--1 yrs	1+--2 yrs	2+--3 yrs	3+--4 yrs	4+--5 yrs	5+--6 yrs	Totals
Females 20-65 yrs	7	4	1		1		1	**14**
Males 20-65 yrs	8		1	2		1		**12**
Total	**15**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**26**

It is evident from the adult employment in Table 8 that more adult females than adult males have jobs or professions requiring higher levels of education, and more adult females than adult males hold positions that require them to use English a great deal with persons in the dominant English-speaking society. There is little difference between adult females and adult males regarding the number of years they have been in the U. S., as shown in Table 9. But regarding the number of years in school (Tables 10 and 11), the adult females have more academic preparation than do the adult males.

Therefore, the employment and education of adult female participants as compared to adult male participants has likely contributed to the higher frequencies of English and CS and the lower frequencies of Spanish usage as compared to adult males.

There are adult females as well as adult males with higher than average educational attainments in the speech community under study, but the more highly educated adult males are more reluctant than adult females to use English. This tendency is seen in example 4 in which JM is an older male who has graduated from the English-dominant high school of the community under study. He still prefers using Spanish rather than English, however, even with a native English speaker, DS. He was observed using English only with non-Spanish speakers in the community.

(4)   DS=0, adult male Anglo bilingual; JM=17, adult male Hispanic bilingual; AP=70, female child Anglo English monolingual; they are in the home of DS; AP is the niece of DS; JM is a friend of DS but introduced to AP only at the beginning of the conversation; JM is seeking help with college-level English mechanics from DS (unsorted transcript, pp. 21-22).

DS: (directed to AP) This is (name-JM).
JM: Hey. Nice to meet you.
AP: Nice to meet you.

DS: He graduated from high school last year. He works at Mount Vernon Mills.
            Is your mother here?
AP: No. (*E)
DS: Oh, here she is, (name-AP). Ok. *Entonces, uh*, let's see. *Bueno, es lo que sé yo.*
        Ok, you want me to talk to you in English or in Spanish?
        'Oh, here she is, (name-AP). Ok. Then, uh, let's see. Well, it's whatever I know.
            Ok, you want me to talk to you in English or in Spanish?'
JM: Um? *Es*
        'Um? It's
DS: *Los dos.*
        'Both.'
JM: *Los dos. Lo que sea.*
        'Both. Whatever.'
DS: Ok. Like they got, uuh, el, uuh, like you have an introduction?
JM: Um, Um.
DS: Do you know? You have a paragraph introduction,then you have like the *para una composición de, de, de, de, cuatro párrafos?*
        'Do you know? You have a paragraph introduction, then you have
        like the for a composition of, of, of, of, four paragraphs?'
JM: *Eh, no, es diferente.*
        'Uh, no, it's different
DS: *No, de cinco párrafos.*
        'No, of five paragraphs.'
JM: *Es diferente. Ellos tienen como un tema, sin, sin, ¿cómo se llaman para uh los* paragraph*, cómo*, paragrafos, paráfos?
        'It's different. They have like a theme, without, without, what are they called for
        uh the paragraph, what, paragraphs, paragraphs?'
DS: paragraphs
JM: *Uh, (unintelligible Spanish) no tienen pa párrafos, sino que es todo junto.*
        Entonces, tienen una como decir, ¿no tiene un libro usted?
        'Uh, (unintelligible Spanish) they don't have pa paragraphs, but instead it's all
            together. Then, they have a how do you say, don't you have a book?'

DS: *¿De qué?*
        'Of what?'

In contrast, example 5 illustrates an adult female AR who chooses to use English almost exclusively even when a bilingual Anglo interlocutor attempts to converse in Spanish.

(5)   AR=37, Hispanic adult female; DS=0, Anglo adult male; both AR and DS are   bilingual; DS is helping AR with a college assignment which is taught in English and for which the written materials are all in English (unsorted transcript, pp. 20-21).
        AR: You're gonna waste your time.
        DS: Hum?
        AR: You're gonna waste your time.
        DS: *Bueno, yo te ayudo y tú me ayudas*
                'OK, I help you and you help me.'.
        AR: Um, hum.
        DS: *A la vez.*
                'At the same time.'
        AR: Yeah, that's the reason. *Bueno, en ser* (clears throat).
                'Yeah, that's the reason. OK, in being (clears throat).'
        DS: (laughing) *Está bien.*
                '(laughing) It's OK.'
        AR: (laughing) Do, do you have other idea for this?
        DS: Uhh, let's see.
        AR: (laughing)
        DS: (reading English from a text) Oh, that's, the, tui we're on the
"intuition" , right?
        AR: What did you put that?
                ………………….. (break in the conversation due to changing tape sides)
        DS: Yeah.
        AR: And I have to do it.
        DS: Well, well I know but, I mean if you got that many, if you got that many questions to do and you gotta type all of that, you think you can do it?
        AR: Until Monday, no?
        DS: Hum?
        AR: I can't.
        DS: It's a lot.

We have noted that female adults have more education and jobs requiring more education and English interaction than adult males. The reason why younger females use significantly more of the most frequent bilingual language type (E>Sinsert) than their male peers is less clear. But the differences in language use between younger male and female participants, however, may also be related to other factors besides gender.

The Guatemalan children of this community in general use English more frequently than others. Also, many of the Peruvian children are from areas on the fringes of the community and attend schools with far fewer Hispanics than most of those from the other regional backgrounds. In light of this observation, it is also noted that of the 14 younger female participants, only one is Guatemalan and one is Peruvian. In contrast, of the 16 younger male participants, two are Guatemalan and four are Peruvian. Also, the one Guatemalan younger female participant lived and attended school in an area of the community more heavily populated by Hispanics and was

observed to use far less English than either of the younger Guatemalan male participants. These differences could at least partly explain the higher E and lower overall CS levels of younger males as compared to younger females. The two younger male Guatemalans, however, used more English than the younger female Guatemalan even though all three lived and attended school in the same area, heavily populated by Hispanics. So, gender here cannot be completely discounted as a social factor relating to use of higher levels of English.

But differences in CS by gender are not completely parallel in all CS studies. Poplack (1982) found in a Spanish/English CS study that women used more intrasentential CS than men. More than half of the CS by females, compared to one-third of CS by men, was intrasentential (p. 254). The remaining two-thirds of the CS by men and slightly less than half of women's CS was intersentential or "[e]xtrasentential" (including tags and interjections), according to Poplack's categories of switches (p. 249). Since Poplack did not include tag and interjection switches in her intrasentential CS category and they are included here in our intrasentential CS category (SEintra), it is impossible to compare the two studies beyond a rough estimate. Nevertheless, in our study, both older and younger females outrank all males in intersentential CS (SEinter), the opposite of Poplack's findings. This includes the SEinter percentage difference showing statistical significance between younger females and older males. Our finding for SEinter may be part of the same tendencies already noted of both younger and older females to use more E>Sinsert than either younger or older males, and of younger males to use exclusively English turns more than any other group.

Tables 2 and 4 reveal that children of both sexes and adult females show greater average percentages of English and of more bilingual language types than adult males. The older female group in our study behaved similarly to the young female adult group[6] in Gal's (1979) Hungarian/German speech community study in which young female adults used more of the prestige form, German, than the other gender/age groups. According to Labov (1972a, b), Gal (1979), and Romaine (1994), it is not at all uncommon for females to show more innovative or prestigious patterns than males. English in this community is the dominant language of the larger community and thus is connected to greater economic benefits and social prestige. Children and women seem to be under more pressure to use English for these reasons.

Gender and age patterns

When average percentages are listed from highest to lowest and within each category as in Table 12, it is apparent that the language types with English morphemes or morpho-syntactic patterns (all types except S) are used most frequently by children of either gender or females of either age group. The CS and convergence types show fewer significant differences than the S and E types, in large part due to much lower percentages (see Table 2). Table 12 shows, however, a trend of percentage differences similar to those that are significant. Table 12 therefore illustrates more clearly how that not only age but also gender are factors related to patterns of language use. Not only

---

[6] The ages of older females in this study range from 20 to 43 years, with an average age of 32.9 yrs. Although in Gal's (1978, 1979) study the range and average age of young women are lower than in this study's older female category, the young women in Gal's study are older than any participant in this study's younger female category.

children, but also females of either age in general show lower average percentages of Spanish and higher average percentages of English and bilingual language types.

Conversely, adults of either gender or males of either age consistently show the lowest percentages of all types with English morphemes or morpho-syntactic patterns. The language type with all Spanish morphemes and Spanish morpho-syntactic patterns (S) is the only type that shows the opposite pattern. Older males use the highest average percentage of S. S only is used in the vast majority of the data, accounting for 61.6% of the entire data corpus. Older males also use the lowest percentage of the category S>Einsert. This category has the lowest number of tokens in the data, accounting for 0.4% of the entire data corpus. For all types with English morphemes or morpho-syntactic patterns except one (S>Econv), older males use this category the least on average. These males clearly demonstrate fewer English and bilingual types than any other gender/age group.

Table 12 Gender/age and language type in order of percentage by language type with high/low percentages indicated (continues in the following page)

gender/age group	language type percentages for each gender/age group	percentage rank among the 4 gender/age groups: upper 2, + lower 2, −
	S	
M20-65	85.7	+
F20-65	70.4	+
F7-13	48.7	−
M7-13	47.5	−
	E	
M7-13	32.3	+
F7-13	20.3	+
F20-65	8.9	−
M20-65	3.5	−
	E>Sinsert	
F7-13	9.1	+
F20-65	3.5	+
M7-13	2.7	−
M20-65	2.3	−
	Seintra	
M7-13	4.5	+
F7-13	3.8	+
F20-65	1.4	−
M20-65	1	−
	E>Sconv	
F20-65	3.5	+
F7-13	2.8	+
M7-13	2.2	−
M20-65	1.2	−
	S>Econv	
M7-13	3.1	+
F7-13	2.6	+
M20-65	0.9	−
F20-65	0.1	−
	Seinter	
F20-65	3	+

F7-13	2.7	+
M7-13	1.1	–
M20-65	0.2	–
	S>Einsert	
F7-13	0.8	+
M7-13	0.4	+
F20-65	0.1	–
M20-65	0	–

Labov (1972a, b) and Gal (1979) both found that females were in the forefront of linguistic change in their respective speech communities. English and English-influenced language usage represents for this speech community the greatest innovation and change, since English is the less dominant language in the Hispanic community. At the same time, however, English is the language of the dominant and more prestigious culture in which the Hispanic community resides. Romaine (1994:121) notes that a possible reason for women's use of linguistic forms related to higher levels of "prestige", in this community, the English language, is "to achieve status which is denied to them through other outlets."

Table 12 also indicates for each gender/age group whether the percentages were one of the higher two percentages (plus sign [+] after the language type name) or one of the lower two percentages (minus sign [–] after the language type name) of the four gender/age groups. Table 13 arranges the information from Table 12 so that patterns in language type usage are apparent between the four gender/age groups. Therefore, for example, younger females show one of the lower two average percentages for S and one of the upper two average percentages for all the other types. Younger females are in the higher two of the average percentages for monolingual English and all bilingual types and only in the lower two for monolingual S. The opposite is true of older males who are in the higher two average percentages only for the monolingual type S and in the lower two for monolingual English and all bilingual types (all types except S). Thus the patterns between the gender/age groups are interestingly symmetrical. Younger females are in the lower half only for S while older males show the exact opposite of this pattern because they are in the lower half for all types except S.

Table 13 Gender/age and high/low percentage language type patterns
Note: [+] after a language type indicates that the gender/age group correlates with one of the higher two gender/age group percentages for that language type; [–] after a language type indicates that the gender/age group correlates with one of the lower two gender/age group percentages for that language type.

	F7-13	M7-13	F20-65	M20-65
S	–	–	+	+
E	+	+	–	–
E>Sinsert	+	–	+	–
SEintra	+	+	–	–
E>Sconv	+	–	+	–
S>Econv	+	+	–	–
SEinter	+	–	+	–
S>Einsert	+	+	–	–

As already noted, female gender and younger age are factors associated with less monolingual Spanish and more English and bilingual types, while male gender and older age are associated with the opposite language types. From Table 13 it is very clear that average percentages of each language type, when grouped into higher and lower halves by gender/age group, show that younger females and older males bear diametrically opposite relations to each other regarding the language types in the data.

In Table 13, language of older females and younger males also shows a symmetrical pattern. For every language type in which older females have one of the higher two percentages, younger males have one of the lower two percentages, and vice versa. Therefore older females and younger males alternate for average percentages between the higher and lower halves. This alternation between higher and lower percentages is apparently due to the combination within each of these two gender/age groups of opposite and conflicting tendencies: (1) conservative male gender with innovative younger age, or (2) innovative female gender with conservative older age. Therefore, younger males and older females represent the middle of the continuum (the two middle columns in Table 13), between the extremes of conservative older males and innovative younger females (the F7-13 and M20-65 columns in Table 13). The younger males and the older females use patterns that are less extreme, in which there is an alternation between higher and lower percentages in the data. There is thus a balance of upper and lower percentages for younger males and older females.

There still are differences, however, between younger males and older females in the data. For example, younger males use much higher percentages of monolingual English (E) and much lower percentages of monolingual Spanish (S) than do older females (see Table 12). Thus, younger age is more predictive of greater English usage than is female gender.

Conclusion, limitations, and implications of the study

Among the 56 members of the Georgia Hispanic community of this study, children use more English than adults, and adult females use more English than adult males. Female gender and younger age are factors associated with less monolingual Spanish and more English and bilingual types, while male gender and older age are associated with more monolingual Spanish and less English and bilingual types. Using Spanish in this community is more conservative, and using English is more innovative. This innovation is therefore more characteristic of female gender and younger age than of male gender or older age. But the more innovative use of Spanish is also associated with the fact that females as a group in this study have higher levels of education and jobs requiring more use of English than their male peers. On the other hand, evidence in the data shows that more highly educated adult males are more reluctant to use English than adult females of a similar educational background. Social pressure to educate children in English dominant schools and the social and economic benefits of English within the larger community seem to favor that both Hispanic women and Hispanic children use more English and more English mixed with Spanish than older Hispanic males.

The sample of participants in this study is not scientifically random, and the number of participants is limited. Therefore, it is not valid to claim, for example, that females are linguistic innovators unless the claim is qualified by revealing other associated social factors of the females in the study, and for each gender/age group. But by discussing other social factors in addition to gender and age, as we have done, we can claim association with the linguistic factors.

Future research can be designed to investigate in more detail the relationship between the social factors considered here and other social factors that may correlate with use of specific language patterns. For example, it is clear that age is associated with more use of English and some bilingual types and that this association is most likely due to the fact that children have higher exposures to English than adults because of English-dominant schooling. Gender differences are less clear. We noted other social factors associated with linguistic differences between males and females, for example, that more female adults have more education than male adults in this study. Further study could factor out education, for example, by examining adult males and females with equal levels of education. Differences between younger males and females are even less clear, but here as well a similar factoring-out approach may serve to see what differences are related to gender alone.

Since language is a resource of its speakers, the data and analysis in this study bear implications for practical application in education and bilingual education. Given the current social and economic status of this community, English will likely be completely acquired by almost all younger participants but only partially by most adults. English classes are offered free to adults but few take advantage of them and of those few who do, fewer still continue to work toward English proficiency. Because a large number of jobs employing Hispanic adults require little to no English, many of these adults are likely to remain among the least proficient English speakers. Those who do not have jobs outside the home, such as housewives, will probably remain the least proficient of all. If the current high numbers of new Hispanic immigrants to Northeast Georgia are maintained, English will continue to be a second language (L2) for a large part if not a majority of the community. The current generation of children will likely, however, become a large group of English proficient adults. At that point, younger age will be less a factor associated with English usage, and adults will be largely divided between less English proficient recent arrivals and more English proficient adults who arrived in the U.S. as children.

If large numbers of Hispanic immigrants continue to arrive to the community, Spanish will continue to be maintained as a strong first language (L1). The presence of English in the data shows, however, that Spanish is being replaced to an extent in the speech of Hispanics in the community. The presence of both CS and Spanish to English convergence (S>Econv) shows that not only some Spanish morphemes but also some Spanish grammatical structure is being replaced by English morphemes and English grammatical structure. This replacement of Spanish morphemes and grammar with English is likely to persist given the current status quo. If immigration slows down in the future this replacement is likely, however, to increase. This situation implies that more attention should be given to Spanish language and literacy studies in the schools if there is a desire to maintain standard spoken and written Spanish.

Spanish is maintained, however, due to the large numbers of new immigrants from Latin America who continue to arrive. But they have lower levels of Spanish reading and writing skills as compared to the English reading and writing skills of the larger English-speaking community. Adult Hispanics in the U.S. have fewer years of schooling than adult members of the surrounding English-dominant community. Therefore, bilingual jobs that require higher level literacy skills in both languages remain out of reach to most Hispanics in this community. This is a problem as well for younger Hispanics since Spanish literacy is not taught in the schools except in classes of Spanish as a second language. Almost all Spanish instruction is designed for English L1 speakers for whom Spanish is a second language instead of for Spanish L1 speakers. To date there are no known efforts, however, to address in the schools the Spanish language needs of those for whom Spanish is a first language.

Works Cited

Gal, Susan. 1978. Peasant men can't get wives: Language change and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society* 7(1):1-16.

Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria.* New York: Academic Press.

García, Eugene E. 1980. The function of language switching during bilingual mother-child interactions. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1(3):243-252.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1995. Code-switching in community, regional, and national repertoires: The myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken (eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 68-89.

Hudson-Edwards, Alan and Garland D. Bills. 1982. Intergenerational language shift in an Albuquerque barrio. In Jon Amastae and Lucía Elías-Olivares (eds.). *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.135-153.

Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1990. Introduction. In Rodolfo Jacobson (ed.). *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon.* New York: Peter Lang, pp. 1-13.

Labov, William. 1972a. *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, William. 1972b. The study of language in its social context. In Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed.). *Language and social context* (1990 reprint). London: Penguin Books, pp. 283-307.

Lindholm, Kathryn J. and Amado M. Padilla. 1978. Language mixing in bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language* 5: 327-335.

Milroy, Lesley and Li Wei. 1995. A social network approach to codeswitching: The example of a bilingual community in Britain. In Lesley Milroy and Pierter Muysken

(eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 136-157.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993 [1997]. *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching* (1997 edition with a new Afterword). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes.* Oxford University Press.

Poplack, Shana. 1982. 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino en español*': Toward a typology of code-switching. In Jon Amastae and Lucía Elías-Olivares (eds.). *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 230-263.

Poplack, Shana. 1983. Intergenerational variation in language use and structure in a bilingual context. *Multilingual Matters* 8:42-70.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1994*. Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Smith, Daniel J. 2002. Patterns of variation in Spanish/English bilingualism in Northeast Georgia. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Austin, Texas: University of Texas at Austin.

Smith, Daniel J. 2004a. Spanish influenced by English in Georgia: Intra-speaker variation.   *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 23(2):163-185.

Smith, Daniel J.   2004b.   "Social and Grammatical Patterns in Spanish/English Bilingualism in Georgia, USA", *Southern Journal of Linguistics* 28(1/2), 1-15.

Smith, Daniel J. 2005. Thresholds leading to shift: Spanish/English codeswitching and convergence in Georgia, USA. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 10(2):207-240.