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Abstract
Bills & Vigil (2008) have established two dialects of New Mexican Spanish – Traditional Spanish and Border Spanish. In general, archaisms and Anglicisms predominate in the north of the state (Traditional Spanish) whereas Mexicanisms predominate in the south (Border Spanish). The recent incorporation of Mexicanisms in the Spanish of Albuquerque has placed it at a dialectal crossroads where a Traditional variety is being supplanted by Mexican Spanish, thereby making it more similar to Border Spanish. This study addresses the extent to which the Spanish of Albuquerque has absorbed Mexicanisms and explores how they were introduced into the community. The use of Mexicanisms is compared to that of archaisms and Anglicisms using an original 20-hour corpus of spoken Albuquerque Spanish. Contrary to the claims of Bills & Vigil (2008), the Spanish of Albuquerque is much more similar to Border Spanish than Traditional Spanish and should be reclassified to reflect this difference.
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EN LA ENCRUCIJADA DIALECTAL: EL ESPAÑOL DE ALBUQUERQUE, NUEVO MÉJICO

Resumen
Bills & Vigil (2008) han establecido la existencia de dos dialectos del español de Nuevo Méjico – el español tradicional y el español de frontera. En general, los arcaísmos y los anglicismos predominan en el norte del estado (español tradicional) mientras que los mexicanismos predominan en el sur (español fronterizo). La reciente incorporación de mexicanismos en el español of Albuquerque lo ha situado en una encrucijada dialectal donde una variedad tradicional está siendo suplantada por el español mejicano,
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haciéndola más similar al español fronterizo. Este estudio se refiere a la medida en que el español de Albuquerque ha absorbido Mexicanismos y explora cómo fueron introducidos en la comunidad. El uso de mexicanismos se compara con el de los arcaísmos y anglicismos utilizando un corpus original de 20 horas de habla española de Albuquerque. Contrariamente a lo que indican Bills & Vigil (2008), el español de Albuquerque es mucho más similar al español de la frontera que el español tradicional y debería ser reclasificado para reflejar esta diferencia.
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1. The Spanish of New Mexico

Spanish expeditions leaving from New Spain (now Mexico) scoured the southwest of what is now the United States throughout the early part of the sixteenth century. The first permanent settlement in this region was not until 1598, however, near present-day Española, New Mexico, which is located about 25 miles northwest of Santa Fe, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Map of New Mexican Cities and Towns
Permanent settlements by Spanish explorers in other areas of what is now the southwest of the United States did not occur until much later (Texas - 1659, Arizona - 1700, California - 1769, Colorado - 1851) (Silva-Corvalán 2001: 298-299). It should be noted that “such ‘Spaniards’ had already become thoroughly ‘Americanized’ – often more specifically ‘Mexicanized’, manifesting a hybrid culture and language enriched by contact with the Native Americans of the Caribbean and Mexico” (Bills & Vigil 1999: 43).

Three major historical factors have shaped New Mexican Spanish. These are: 1) relative isolation from the rest of the Spanish-speaking world for several centuries; 2) the gradual settlement of English speakers in New Mexico beginning in the mid-1800s; and 3) massive waves of immigration of Spanish speakers, primarily from Mexico, into the United States in the second half of the twentieth century.

The linguistic consequences of these developments include the common use of archaisms, Anglicisms, and Mexicanisms. Since New Mexico was the first area to be settled by speakers using now-archaic traits of Spanish and it was so distant from other Spanish-speaking areas, many archaic forms have survived among New Mexican Spanish speakers, particularly among older speakers. Many now-archaic traits of Spanish have been preserved due to New Mexico’s relative isolation from other dialects of Spanish for such an extensive period. This isolation resulted from the fact that New Mexico was located “1,500 miles from Mexico City and initially 750 miles from the closest Hispanophone town in Mexico” (Bills & Vigil 1999: 43). Due to such limited contact with other varieties of Spanish for such a long period of time, archaic features have been largely preserved in northern New Mexican Spanish. From the extensive data collected in the New Mexico-Colorado Spanish Survey (hereafter NMCOSS), Bills & Vigil (1999) have revealed the distribution of archaic lexical forms such as túnico/traje ‘woman’s dress’ (standard vestido), mismo ‘same’ (standard mismo), asína ‘thus’ (standard así) in various parts of New Mexico. Archaic morphological forms (such as vide ‘I saw’ (standard vi), vió ‘he/she saw’ (standard vio), semos ‘we are’ (standard somos), haiga ‘there is/are, pres. subj.’ (standard haya)) and phonological forms (”such as the retention of the /x/ fricative corresponding to orthographic h” (Bills & Vigil 1999: 50) and retention of labiodental [v] corresponding to orthographic v (Torres Cacoullos & Ferreira 2000) are also prevalent in this dialect. These archaic features have been passed
on to younger generations, though younger speakers use them to a lesser extent (Bills & Vigil 2008) since many of them do not speak Spanish and largely possess receptive skills in this language (Bills 1997; Bills & Vigil 1999; Bills & Vigil 2008; Hernández-Chávez, Bills & Hudson 1996; Hudson, Hernández-Chávez & Bills 1995). The relative isolation of Spanish in present-day New Mexico persisted with very little external contact until the mid-1800s. With the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, “a great swath of northern Mexico was ceded to the United States [...] One surprising consequence of this event was an accelerated opening up of new areas to Hispano settlers” (Bills & Vigil 1999: 48).

Settlement by non-Hispanos was relatively slow. According to Williams (1986: 126), “ Anglo-Americans constituted less than 9 percent of the territorial population [of New Mexico] in 1880." By the 1940s, however, “only half of the population of New Mexico was Hispanic” (Simmons 1977: 163). The settlement of non-Hispanos has had a very strong impact on the Spanish of the area, but its impact has been less linguistic than it has been socio-cultural. Contact with English has contributed many loanwords to the lexical repertory of New Mexican Spanish, some established and some spontaneous, and has also resulted in frequent code-switching among bilinguals in all areas of the state. The historical context just described has directly affected the use of English-origin loanwords in the Spanish of New Mexico. Common loanwords include troca (standard camioneta ‘truck’), lonche (standard almuerzo ‘lunch’), and reporte (standard informe ‘report’). Moreover, English has displaced the use of Spanish to a great degree and has gradually become the dominant language of the state. According to Bills & Vigil (1999: 55), “the children of Hispanic heritage are abandoning the Spanish language entirely and growing up as English monolinguals. More and more, those who speak Spanish in the southwest United States [read New Mexico] tend to be first-generation Mexican immigrants and their children”. Though this situation may be reversing somewhat due to bilingual education and heritage language programs throughout the state, the effect of the dominance of English is undeniable.

The speech of Mexican immigrants has also affected New Mexican Spanish, primarily at the lexical and morphological levels. The use of Mexicanisms, which Company Company (2010: xvi), in her introduction to the Diccionario de Mexicanismos, defines as “a collection of words, phrases, expressions, and meanings characteristic of
the speech of Mexico, which distinguish the Mexican variety from Peninsular Spanish” is common throughout the state (translation mine). These are not simply forms that scarcely exist in other varieties (such as *chamaco/a* ‘child’ or *zacate* ‘grass’) but also forms whose meaning is different in other varieties (such as *padre* ‘cool’ and *carnal* ‘brother’). The presence of Mexican speakers is now felt by many in the community due to several decades of increased immigration. Several participants for the current study indicated this during interviews, as shown in the following comments:

(1) **E:** *Y, y, y pues, uh, el, el, ¿el español se habla mucho aquí en Barelas o ...?*

   ‘And, and, and, so, uh, uh, is Spanish spoken a lot here in Barelas or ...?’

   **C:** *No. No como más antes. No más los que hablan español, uh. Es muy, uh, es más los países, los mexicanos, los que hablan.*

   ‘No. Not like before. The only ones who speak Spanish, uh. It’s really, uh, it’s more the Mexicans, uh, who speak.’

   **E:** *Y los viejos también, ¿no?*

   ‘And old people too, right?’

   **C:** *Y los chicanos, nosotros, que son de Barelas, hablan como, uh, el slang.*

   ‘And the Chicanos, us, that are from Barelas, speak like, uh, slang.’ (15/10: 59-11: 21)

(2) **Hay familias aquí que vivieron hasta el ... ¿Quién sabe? Pero, uh, ahora estos días son muchos mexicanos ahora.**

   ‘There are families that lived here until the ... Who knows? But, uh, now these days there are a lot of Mexicans now.’ (15/24: 55-25: 10)

The use of Mexican Spanish was stigmatized by many New Mexicans in the past, who claimed a Spanish heritage and rejected connections to Mexico. This discrimination is recounted by several participants for the current study who witnessed it first-hand, as exemplified in the following comments:

---

1 According to U.S. Census data obtained from American Fact Finder (factfinder.census.gov), Mexican immigration to Albuquerque tripled from 1980 to 2010. In the 1980s, a total 4,882 immigrants of Mexican origin migrated to Albuquerque. By the 1990s, this number nearly doubled to 9,067. A decade later, that number grew even more, with 12,516 Mexican immigrants settling in Albuquerque during the 2000s.
(3) Había restaurantes aquí y lugares que tenían unas, uh, cartas en las puertas, uh, cuando entra que decían “No se permiten perros ni mexicanos”.
‘There were restaurants here and places that had some, uh, signs on the doors, uh, when you enter that said “No dogs or Mexicans allowed”.’ (05/7: 20-7: 31)

This type of discrimination, of course, is a consequence of the myth that northern New Mexicans are descended from Spain. The same participant, however, rejects this idea in the following comment.

‘I’m, like they say here in English, Spanish American. You can’t be Spanish American, or Spanish. What that means to me is that you were born in Spain and you became a citizen here. And then they say, “No no no, I’m pure.” Or like they also tell me, “We don’t have mixed blood. We’re pure Spanish.” How pure? (05/2: 42-3: 07)

Somewhat ironically, given the lack of prestige of Mexican Spanish in the past, the presence of recent immigrants has resulted in the exposure of more standard linguistic forms of Spanish to New Mexicans. As a result, less standard lexical and morphological forms are gradually being replaced by more standard Mexican forms, particularly by younger generations (Bills & Vigil 2008). The standardization of New Mexican Spanish is also resulting from younger New Mexicans’ exposure to the standard form of Spanish taught in universities. Since Spanish is a heritage language for many younger New Mexicans, they enroll in university classes in order to learn the grammar of a language they have heard used in the home throughout their lives. Bills & Vigil give the examples of vestido ‘woman’s dress’, which is replacing túnico and traje; falda ‘skirt’, which is replacing naguas; standard blusa ‘blouse’, which is replacing cuerpo; and lata ‘tin can’, which is replacing bote and jarro (Bills & Vigil 1999: 56). More standard morphological forms are also being learned at the expense of non-standard forms. For example, non-
standard vide ‘I saw’ is being replaced by standard vi in large part due to more exposure to formal Spanish in schools (Bills & Vigil 2008: 227).

2. Barelas, Albuquerque

The Albuquerque neighborhood of Barelas, which is located just south of downtown, was one of the first permanent settlements in New Mexico. As such, the Spanish of this community is the longest-standing spoken variety in Albuquerque. Spanish colonizers heading north along the Camino Real used the landing at Barelas (originally spelled “Varelas”) in the early 1500s as a crossover point on the Río Grande, which it still borders to the east. Due to its importance, it was used during expeditions led by Coronado in 1540 and Oñate in 1598. Barelas was formally established in the late 1600s as a ranching settlement by Don Pedro Varela. Currently, the neighborhood covers about ten square blocks south of downtown Albuquerque, running north and south from Coal Avenue to Bridge Boulevard and east and west from 2nd Street to 12th Street. This location is shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Map of Barelas [Source: Google Maps]

The Spanish of Barelas will represent that of Albuquerque for the current study. Other, more recently established areas of Albuquerque have been populated by Mexican immigrants rather than native burqueños. It is important that a non-immigrant community represent Albuquerque since the Spanish spoken in the city is not Mexican Spanish. The variety of Spanish analyzed in the current study is distinctly New Mexican.
Due to its long history, the variety of Spanish spoken in Barelas is actually one of the oldest in the entire state of New Mexico and represents features that have long been associated with traditional New Mexican Spanish, which is linguistically quite distinct from its neighbor to the south (Bills & Vigil 2008). According to Bills & Vigil (2008: 5), speakers of this dialect “represent early settlement prior to the twentieth century and today reside primarily in the upper Río Grande drainage area of central and northern New Mexico”. The variety of Spanish spoken in Barelas represents one of the southernmost dialects of traditional New Mexican Spanish. Historically, Barelas was not considered an immigrant community. Unlike other areas of Albuquerque, the Spanish of Barelas has not yet assimilated many of the characteristics of border Mexican Spanish, which has greatly influenced the Spanish spoken in the southern part of the state. The incorporation of traits from border Mexican Spanish in Barelas began more recently as a natural result of growing numbers of immigrants moving into the community. In this sense, Barelas represents a dialectal crossroads where a traditional, somewhat archaic variety is being supplanted by border Mexican Spanish.

Traditional New Mexican Spanish is most distinct from Border New Mexican Spanish in terms of its lexical inventory, which has been documented extensively in the past century (Bills & Vigil 2008; Cobos 1983; Espinosa 1909; Hills 1906; Ornstein 1975). In general terms, archaisms and Anglicisms are more prominently used in the northern two-thirds of the state (Bills & Vigil 2008: 51-64, 173) whereas modern Mexican terms are more commonly used in the southern third (Bills & Vigil 2008: 39). According to Bills & Vigil (2008: 39), “certain features characteristic of the popular speech of modern Mexico prevail mostly in the southern part of New Mexico [...] and in other areas where immigrants have been most likely to find employment. The spatial constraints on this most recent Mexican influence are the basis for our distinguishing the two major dialects we label Border Spanish and Traditional Spanish”.

The purpose of the current study is determine the extent to which the Spanish of Barelas has incorporated Mexicanisms; if it has incorporated a significant number of them, to determine whether the Spanish of Albuquerque is in need of reclassification as

---

3 The use of the term traditional here, though somewhat contentious even to the authors themselves, is used only insofar as a distinction with southern (or border) New Mexican Spanish. It by no means implies that this variety is more traditional, in the cultural sense, than any other variety.
a dialect. To accomplish this, words of the three lexical types just discussed (archaisms, Anglicisms, and Mexicanisms) included in the dialect maps in Bills & Vigil (2008) were investigated using a 20-hour original corpus of spoken Bareleño Spanish recorded by the author in 2010. Since the number of these terms is hardly vast enough to make any definitive claims as to whether the Spanish of Albuquerque more closely approximates Traditional Spanish or Border Spanish, the entire Barelas corpus will be examined, with each of the terms encountered in the corpus being classified as archaisms, Anglicisms, and Mexicanisms. Via the quantitative analysis of patterns of usage of these lexical types, the possibility of reclassifying the Spanish of Albuquerque will be explored.

3. Methodology

The two major dialects of New Mexican Spanish (the Traditional Spanish of the north and the Border Spanish of the south) as proposed by Bills & Vigil (2008) are based on the geographical distributions of the three lexical types just described (archaisms, Anglicisms and Mexicanisms) as reported by 357 Spanish speakers. As part of the NMCOSS, various terms fitting these types were solicited from participants “by means of pictures and real objects, which were then grouped into semantic categories (colors, birds, domesticated animals, foods, clothing, etc.)” (Bills & Vigil 2008: 27). The distributions of these terms are displayed in a series of dialect maps in this work. A corpus of spoken Albuquerque Spanish from the neighborhood of Barelas will be utilized to identify terms belonging to these three lexical types given that the number of forms presented in Bills & Vigil (2008) is limited and does not include the range of forms present in the Barelas corpus. The advantage of using interview data is that these forms were never solicited from participants and, as such, reflect their actual usage within the

---

4 None of the Mexicanisms from Bills & Vigil (2008) were encountered in the Barelas corpus. This is largely due to the infrequency with which these words are actually used in day-to-day discourse (e.g. partidura/partido/parte ‘part (in hair)’; chuparroso/colibri ‘hummingbird’; etc.). Of the archaisms and Anglicisms given in Bills & Vigil (2008), three of each type were encountered in the Barelas corpus. These are: túnico ‘dress’, albercoque ‘apricot’, vide ‘I saw’, troca ‘pickup truck’, suera ‘sweater’, and queque ‘cake’.
community. The use of interview data will ensure an accurate determination of the extent to which each lexical type is used in the Spanish of Albuquerque.

3.1 Fieldwork

Sociolinguistic interviews with 15 fluid bilinguals of Spanish and English were conducted by the author in the summer of 2010 in the neighborhood of Barelas. Though this number seems small, there are only 21 speakers from Albuquerque represented in the NMCOSS, which is far and wide the most comprehensive documentation of New Mexican Spanish. Furthermore, Barelas is a small, tightknit community of fewer than 3,500 residents and, as such, fewer speakers are needed to achieve an accurate representation of the neighborhood. All participants have lived in Barelas for at least 20 years. In an attempt to approximate the vernacular, which is representative of unmonitored, informal speech (Labov 1972, 1984), various protocols were followed. Initial interviews were set up with close friends and family members of a main contact in the community who is a close friend of the author. More importantly, however, is that almost every interview was recorded only after having made initial contact and engaged in social interactions with participants. Only a couple of interviews were conducted “on the spot” (i.e. immediately after meeting a participant). Participants chose the locations and times of the interviews. They were encouraged to speak about topics that were of particular interest to them and were not discouraged from switching between Spanish and English, though an attempt was made to steer speech toward Spanish whenever possible. No pre-written questions were used in any of the interviews, allowing for spontaneous interaction and fluid discourse. Each speaker was recorded in Spanish for approximately one hour, yielding a total of more than 20 hours of recorded spontaneous conversation. All interviews were recorded as WAV files using a lapel-style omnidirectional microphone as this is one of the least unobtrusive means by which to capture spontaneous language data. After the interviews were conducted, they were transcribed and organized by interview session in order to facilitate the process of token extraction.
3.2 Selection of participants

In order to achieve as representative a sample as possible, the selection of participants was based on 2000 census data (factfinder.census.gov), which includes the neighborhood of Barelas as well as adjoining areas spanning downtown Albuquerque to the north and the South Broadway section of the city to the south. According to census data, there are 22,349 residents living in this part of the city. Unfortunately, detailed demographic data for the neighborhood of Barelas is not available through the 2000 census. For more detailed sociodemographic data, the website www.city-data.com was used. More specific population estimates show that the population of Barelas is very small, with approximately 3,500 residents.

Language use is shaped largely by the social and professional changes one experiences throughout one’s lifespan. Younger adult speakers, for example, are actively engaged in raising children and pursuing professional pursuits while older speakers may be retired or have children who have already moved away from home. For this reason, participants were selected based on generational groupings that correspond roughly with these changes (Group 1 = 25-50; Group 2 = > 51). Unfortunately, census data only show the number of residents who are under the age of five, between the ages of 18 and 65, and older than 65. Given the lack of more specific figures with regards to the 18 to 65 year-old group, a roughly equal number of participants was chosen for each generational grouping.

With respect to the population’s distribution by sex, census data are much more specific. According to these data, there are 10,712 women and 11,637 men living in this area of the city. Population estimates by sex for Barelas (www.city-data.com) parallel these figures (1,703 females and 1,796 males). With this in mind, a roughly equal number of females and males were interviewed. To ensure the accurate representation of general social characteristics among the set of participants, an approximately equal

---

5 Census data for 2010 according to zip codes were not available at the time of authorship.
6 For detailed information see http://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/South-Valley-Albuquerque-NM.html. The specific nature of these data are due to the use of this website for real estate purposes.
number of male and female participants was chosen for each generational grouping (G1/F = 4; G1/M = 4; G2/F = 3; G2/M = 4).

Barelas is a low-income neighborhood which has faced economic hardships since the decline of the railway boom that led to relative prosperity in the area at the turn of the twentieth century. The average single-family income in 2009, according to data from www.city-data.com, was only $24,020, just over half of the average single-family income for greater Albuquerque in the same year ($44,594). The occupations held by residents are also a reflection of its middle to middle-lower class history. Occupations requiring advanced degrees and formal training are scarce among the neighborhood’s residents while occupations in service, construction, maintenance, production, transportation, and sales are extremely common. According to www.city-data.com, 72.2% of all employed women in the community hold these jobs while a total of 87.1% of men have similar jobs.\(^7\) Participants were selected based on this occupational distribution in the community. Of a total of 15 participants, only two participants (one male and one female) have jobs that require advanced degrees and formal training.

Though participants were not selected based on language preference or their parents’ nationalities, these two variables are important in the current study in that they may be conditioning the use of Mexicanisms in Barelas. There is a tacit assumption in the community that Spanish is being lost at the expense of English, especially among younger speakers, and that the only way to maintain Spanish is by speaking it in the home.\(^8\) According to several participants,

\[\text{(4) } \text{Se les va olvidando en eso que van aprendiendo el inglés. Se les va olvidando, como siguen hablando tanto el inglés en la escuela, con los amigos.}\]

‘They’re forgetting it as they’re learning English. They’re forgetting it, as they keep speaking so much English in school, with their friends.’ (14/14: 56-15: 04)

\(^7\) It should be noted that these percentages would be almost the same if women in the community were employed in transportation, which represents 10% of the male workforce.

\(^8\) This is true for the 15 participants of the current study. Of the youngest generation, not a single participant prefers Spanish. Of the eight younger speakers, three prefer English and five claim to have no preference at all. The older generation exhibits a wider range of variation regarding language preference, with only two speakers who prefer English and two who claim no preference at all; and, not surprisingly three speakers actually prefer Spanish.
It should come as no surprise, then, that all of the participants in the current study who prefer English were raised in a household in which both parents were born in the United States. Participants with at least one Mexican-born parent either prefer Spanish or have no preference. This does not mean that a participant raised by two U.S.-born parents, however, automatically prefers English. This is also an assumption made by many and one which is particularly untrue of older speakers, many of whom grew up speaking Spanish, as expressed in the following comment:

(6) Parece que las gentes ahora, que vienen de México, están aquí y me dicen, “Pues, ¿dónde aprendiste tú todo el español tan bonito?” Les digo, “¡Pues, yo nunca lo perdí!”

‘It seems that the people now, that are coming from Mexico, they’re here and they say to me, “So, where did you learn all of that really beautiful Spanish?” I tell them, “Well, I never lost it.”’ (04/22: 43-22: 54)

Of the participants for the current study, about an even number were raised in a household of two U.S.-born parents (N=8) as were raised in a household with at least one Mexican-born parent (N=7). There is a greater preference for English in the community overall with five participants who prefer this language, three participants who prefer Spanish, and seven participants who have no strong preference for either language.

4. Results

All examples of the three lexical types for the current study – archaisms, Anglicisms and Mexicanisms – were extracted from transcriptions of the Barelas
interviews. These types appear in the appendix. The raw numbers for each of the three lexical types in the Spanish of Albuquerque are shown in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. Raw Numbers of Each Lexical Type in Albuquerque Spanish](image)

The number of Mexicanisms (N=41) in the Spanish of Albuquerque is over four times that of archaisms. A mere 10 archaic lexical types were encountered in the Barelas corpus. This is important given that archaisms have long characterized Traditional New Mexican Spanish. The relative lack of use of archaic forms in the Spanish of Albuquerque demonstrates that the Spanish of the city should no longer be considered Traditional Spanish. The use of Anglicisms is also characteristic of Traditional Spanish, but the number of these forms (N=18) is less than half that of Mexicanisms in the Spanish of Albuquerque. The extensive use of Mexicanisms, some of which are very recent (even in varieties of Mexican Spanish), is somewhat surprising given that the Spanish of Albuquerque has always been classified as Traditional New Mexican Spanish, which is characterized by a lack of Mexicanisms. The use of Mexicanisms is supposed to only be common in Border Spanish; but these results clearly show that this is not the case. The use of Mexicanisms is quite robust in the Spanish of Albuquerque, which seems to be the result of an influx of Mexican-born immigrants to the city over the past several decades. It would seem that the use of Mexicanisms comes from those immigrants and their children. Since only native-born bareleños were interviewed for the current study,
the use of Mexicanisms by foreign-born Mexican residents will not be explored here. It is plausible, however, that their children have been instrumental in incorporating Mexicanisms in the Spanish of the city. To further explore the leaders of lexical change in the community, we will not turn to the rates of use of Mexicanisms according to the social characteristics of participants. Frequencies of use of Mexicanisms according to these characteristics are displayed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30/59</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114/189</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First (25-50)</td>
<td>77/103</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second (≥ 51)</td>
<td>67/145</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38/57</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>90/146</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>16/45</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Birthplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>31/48</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>113/200</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex: $\chi^2 = 1.66; \, df = 1; \, p = 0.198$; Generation: $\chi^2 = 20.2; \, df = 1; \, p = 0.000$; Language Preference: $\chi^2 = 11.9; \, df = 2; \, p = 0.003$; Parents’ Birthplace: $\chi^2 = 1.04; \, df = 1; \, p = 0.308$

Table 1. Use of Mexicanisms according to participants’ social characteristics

First, it should be noted that not only is there a greater number of types of Mexicanisms in the Spanish of Albuquerque (N = 41; see Figure 3) but also a greater number of tokens of Mexicanisms (N = 144) than archaisms and Anglicisms combined (N = 104). It can fairly be said, then, that the use of Mexicanisms is much more characteristic of the Spanish of Albuquerque than is the use of either archaisms or Anglicisms. That said, the only factors that seem to be of any significance in the
conditioning of use of Mexicanisms within the community are generation and language preference. Frequencies of use of Mexicanisms are very similar by sex (with males using Mexicanisms slightly more frequently than females, at a rate of 60.3% compared to 50.8%) and, somewhat surprisingly, by parents’ birthplace (with those of Mexican-born parents using them only about 8% more often than those with U.S.-born parents). It was expected that speakers with at least one Mexican-born parent would use Mexicanisms at a considerably higher rate than other members of the community. Alas, this is not the case. Members of the youngest generation, rather, regardless of where their parents were born, are those who use Mexicanisms most often. They use Mexicanisms at a rate far higher than that of members of the oldest generation (74.8% compared to 46.2%). This difference is similar according to language preference. Very surprisingly, the use of Mexicanisms is most common among participants who have no clear preference for either Spanish or English and those who prefer English. On the surface, this is counterintuitive, but this result is likely due to the fact that younger speakers categorically prefer English or have no preference. In other words, the rates of use are high among these participants not due to their language preferences but due to their age. To see which of these factor groups is statistically significant in the conditioning of use of Mexicanisms in the Spanish of the community, we will now turn to a multivariate analysis of the social factors described in the previous section and their possible conditioning effect on the use of Mexicanisms in Albuquerque Spanish. This analysis was conducted using GoldVarb X, which is a statistical analysis program that generates probability weights corresponding to observed frequencies in a corpus (Lawrence, Robinson & Tagliamonte 2001). This type of analysis is well suited for the current study in that it was designed to handle non-continuous dependent variables with two possible applied variants or groups of variants (in this case, Mexicanisms vis-à-vis archaisms and Anglicisms). In this way, statistically relevant probabilities for the social conditioning of the use of Mexicanisms, which are only characteristic of Border Spanish, can be assessed for a variety in which their use has been claimed to be minimal. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 2.
Factor | N  | %  | Factor | Weight
---|----|----|---|------
First Generation | 77 | 74.8 |    | .67  
Second Generation | 67 | 46.2 |    | .37  

Other factor groups included in analysis: 1) sex, 2) language preference, and 3) parents’ birthplace.

Table 2. Multivariate analysis of the probabilities of co-occurrence of the use of Mexicanisms and participants’ social characteristics (p = 0.000, N = 248, Input = 0.589, Log likelihood = -158.282)

As suspected, it is not language preference that conditions the use of Mexicanisms in the community, but rather generation. It is statistically probable that younger speakers will use Mexicanisms in their Spanish (with a probability weight of .67) while it is statistically improbable that older speakers will do the same (with a probability weight of only .37). None of the other factor groups are statistically significant. This means that younger speakers are incorporating Mexicanisms into their Spanish regardless of their language preference, sex, or whether they grew up in a household with at least one Mexican-born parent. These results make it clear that the idea that having Mexican parents leads to maintenance of Spanish is not true. The presence of Mexican Spanish in the community has already led to maintenance among many younger speakers, who have incorporated Mexicanisms into their Spanish since this is their model of Spanish in the community. The use of Traditional Spanish is only common among older speakers of the community who prefer Spanish. These speakers (N=3) grew up speaking Traditional Spanish and, as such, use very few Mexicanisms relative to the rest of the community (at a rate of only 35.6%; see Table 1). If this change continues to advance, the Spanish of Albuquerque will more closely resemble Border Spanish with the passing of this generation. This should not be altogether surprising since younger speakers are in constant contact with some variety of Mexican Spanish. It is the variety taught in Albuquerque schools, many of which have bilingual education programs. Younger members of the community have consistent interactions with other younger speakers.
who were raised in households with at least one Mexican-born parent. Given the strength of peers on the language development of adolescents (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986) and teenagers (Eckert 1989), it is no surprise that Mexicanisms are being spread into the community by the youngest generation. Their use seems to start with children of Mexican immigrants, who began settling in the city in great numbers starting in the 1980s. Now these children are grown, as are the children of U.S.-born parents, who have now assimilated these characteristics. This pattern will likely not reverse with continuing immigration from Mexico, which will ultimately lead to the incorporation of a greater number of Mexicanisms into the Spanish of Albuquerque over time.

5. Conclusions

The Spanish of Albuquerque does not fit neatly into a dialectal classification as either Traditional Spanish or Border Spanish given that, while it does include archaisms (N = 10) and Anglicisms (N = 18), which are characteristic of Traditional Spanish, it includes many more Mexicanisms (N = 41). As it would be absurd to label Albuquerque Spanish “Border Spanish” since it is located some 270 miles from the border and it cannot be labeled “Traditional Spanish” since the use of Mexicanisms in this variety far outnumbers that of archaisms and Anglicisms (by type and token frequency), I propose that Albuquerque Spanish be considered a third major dialect of New Mexican Spanish. The use of Mexicanisms in Albuquerque Spanish is coming from younger speakers who have grown up with other speakers of Mexican-born parents. Their use is not due to the children of Mexican immigrants themselves, however, as clearly shown in Tables 1 and 2. Increased Mexican immigration starting in the 1980s has resulted in the greater use of Mexicanisms, which have spread throughout the city and have begun to supplant archaisms slowly, partly due to the greater prestige afforded to Mexican Spanish and lesser prestige afforded to archaisms and partly due to the fact that Mexican Spanish is the model for Spanish for younger speakers in the community. In this sense, the entire fabric of Albuquerque Spanish can be seen as changing, which has been happening for quite some time. It seems that Traditional Spanish is alive and well in northern New Mexico among the residents who actually speak the language. It could be true, however,
that Albuquerque is representative of a larger change that may affect even smaller communities of the north. It remains to be seen whether “the Traditional Spanish of New Mexico will undergo the dialect extinction that has already befallen the Traditional Spanish of other southwestern states [...] and will have been reabsorbed by its “mother tongue”, Mexican Spanish” (Bills & Vigil 2008: 345). Regardless of the lexical characteristics of the Spanish spoken in northern New Mexico, it seems that the preservation of Spanish is not as imperiled as it was several decades ago. Somewhat ironically, Mexican Spanish, which was once denigrated among native New Mexicans, has led to the preservation of this language in a place where it has been spoken for over 400 years.
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APPENDIX
EXAMPLES OF LEXICAL TYPES IN THE SPANISH OF ALBUQUERQUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaisms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>albercoques</td>
<td>semos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a(n)sina</td>
<td>traiba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haiga</td>
<td>truje/trujo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muncho/a(s)</td>
<td>túnicos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naiden/nadien</td>
<td>vide/vido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglicisms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apenar (pagar, from ‘peni’)</td>
<td>rentar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biles</td>
<td>reporte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cachear</td>
<td>rofe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chequear/chechar</td>
<td>rostear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lonche</td>
<td>suera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marqueta</td>
<td>tracas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mopear</td>
<td>troca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentes</td>
<td>troquero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queque</td>
<td>yarda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mexicanisms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atole</td>
<td>gacho</td>
<td>plebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carnal (hermano)</td>
<td>güero/a(s)</td>
<td>quiubo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerecillos</td>
<td>jale (trabajo)</td>
<td>ruco/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamac/o/a</td>
<td>jefito/a(s)</td>
<td>simón (sí)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaparral</td>
<td>loquera (delincuencia)</td>
<td>sobadora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaparrito/a(s)</td>
<td>mande (¿cómo?)</td>
<td>suave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chavalo</td>
<td>manitos</td>
<td>trapear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chido</td>
<td>nomás (sin razón ni finalidad)</td>
<td>valevergas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chingones</td>
<td>onda (ambiente)</td>
<td>vato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cholo</td>
<td>órale</td>
<td>verga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cirqueros</td>
<td>pachuco</td>
<td>zacate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corretear</td>
<td>padre (chido)</td>
<td>zafado/a (chiflado/a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desarmador</td>
<td>paisa</td>
<td>zoquete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjarrar</td>
<td>pinta (prisión)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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