Identity in discourse: person-reference among Mexicans in the Southeastern U.S.

Philip P. Limerick

This study examines the identity of Mexican immigrants through their choice of person-reference in discourse. Through positioning theory (Davies and Harré 1990), the social orientation of speakers with respect to other people is explored by analyzing both personal (e.g. *yo* 'I') and impersonal (e.g. *uno* 'one') forms, as well as discursive strategies such as distancing and involvement. The data consist of ten sociolinguistic interviews carried out in Roswell, Georgia with native Spanish-speakers from Mexico who talk about their experiences adapting to Georgia. Results indicate that the most common choice in person-reference is first-person singular, although impersonal forms are also quite common. Speakers use person-reference forms to express involvement in the majority of cases; however, they also use impersonal forms as a distancing strategy. The findings suggest that speakers in the present analysis construct their identities both individually and collectively, as revealed by person-reference devices.

Keywords: Mexican Spanish, migration, person-reference, identity, Spanish in the US.

La identidad en el discurso: la referencia personal entre los mexicanos en los EE. UU. surorientales. Este estudio examina la identidad de los inmigrantes mexicanos mediante la elección de referencia personal. Utilizando la teoría de posicionamiento (Davies y Harré 1990), se explora la orientación social de los hablantes con respecto a otras personas al analizar tanto las formas personales (ej. *yo*) como las formas impersonales (ej. *uno*) así como las estrategias discursivas, tales como el distanciamiento y el involucramiento. Los datos consisten en diez entrevistas sociolingüísticas que se llevaron a cabo en Roswell, Georgia con hispanohablantes nativos de México que hablan de sus experiencias de adaptarse a la vida en Georgia. Los resultados indican que la elección de referencia personal más común es la primera-persona singular, pero que las formas impersonales también son bien comunes. Los hablantes usan la

referencia para expresar involucramiento en la mayoría de los casos; no obstante, también usan las formas impersonales como una estrategia de distanciamiento. Los hallazgos sugieren que los hablantes en los datos presentes construyen sus identidades tanto de modo individual como colectivo como se revela por la elección de referencia personal.

Palabras claves: español mexicano, migración, referencia personal, identidad, español en los EE. UU.

1. Introduction

The choice in person-reference linked to the speaker's identity has been examined by various authors in different social contexts (e.g. De Fina 2003; Lerner and Kitzinger 2007; De Fina and King 2011)[1]. Besides their referential function, expressions of person-reference such as pronouns can express distancing, involvement, and solidarity with participants and topics as well as conveying responsibility or lack thereof (De Fina 2003). The goal of this paper is to explore identity/identity formation through the speakers' social orientation in discourse. Social orientation is defined by De Fina (2003: 51) as "the position of the speaker with respect to the dimensions of interdependence versus autonomy from others and of personalization versus depersonalization of experience." To examine social orientation, positioning theory will be adopted (Davies and Harré 1990) and two types of linguistic positioning devices in the discourse of Mexican immigrants in Georgia will be analyzed: (a) personal vs. impersonal expressions and (b) individual vs. collective reference. 'Positioning', according to Davies and Harré (1990: 48), is "the discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines." For example, it has been argued that *yo* 'I' stresses the speaker's agentive and personal role, whereas *nosotros* 'we' stresses group identification. *Uno* 'one' could indicate depersonalization or generalization of experience (De Fina 2003; De Fina and King 2011). As De Fina (2003: 52) highlights, speakers can manipulate pronouns to convey "subtle social meanings" relating to their identities or to their 'position' with respect to other people and to their experiences. The present study examines how Mexican speakers represent themselves in relation to others through the choice and negotiation of person-reference in the context of immigration. Specifically, I intend to answer the following questions:

(1) What person-reference forms are used as positioning devices and what do they indicate about the speakers' social orientation?

    a. Do the speakers show individual or collective identities through their use of these forms?

    b. Are their identities personalized or depersonalized, as revealed by their choice of personal/impersonal expressions?

(2) What are the functions and strategies of such forms in the different contexts?

To answer these questions, I have analyzed the discourse from sociolinguistic interviews that I conducted with Mexican immigrants in Roswell, Georgia during the summer of 2015. This data was chosen because Spanish in the Southeastern U.S. is generally understudied (but see, e.g., Carter 2005, 2014; Montes-Alcalá and Sweetnich 2014; Wilson 2013, 2014; Limerick 2017), and Spanish-speakers in this region are underrepresented since most of the research on U.S. Spanish has been done in the Southwest and Northeast (see Wilson 2013; Limerick, forthcoming). This study examines the choice, function, and distribution of person-reference in relation to the identity and social orientation of speakers in this region.

Roswell, Georgia, an exurb of Atlanta, reflects the patterns of Hispanic immigration in the Southeastern U.S. This area, unlike other regions of the U.S. which have contained stable Hispanic communities for centuries, is only recently experiencing the emergence of long-term Spanish-speaking communities (Wolfram, Kohn, and Callahan-Price 2011). The city's population has been largely Caucasian, with African-Americans being the largest minority group. However, by the year 2000 Latinos began to outnumber the African-American population and experienced an increase of 75% between 2000 and 2010 (see Table 1), comprising 16.6% of Roswell's total population (U.S. Census Bureau 2010a), most of them (11.5%), Mexicans (U.S. Census Bureau 2010b). It is this lack of established presence of the Spanish-speaking community that explains the lack of research on U.S. Southeast Spanish.

Population	2000	2010
Total Population	79,334	88,346
White	64,666	66,010
Black or African American	6,773	10,373
Asian	2,964	3,565
Some Other Race	3,237	5,846
Two or More Races	1,511	2,241
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	261
Hawaiian Native/other Pacific Islander	23	50
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	8,421	14,699

Table 1. *Roswell demographics*
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2010 Census of Population

The paper is organized as follows: previous research on person-reference and identity will be discussed in section 2; the present study's methodology is discussed in section 3. Section 4 addresses the results, and section 5 consists of discussion, conclusions, and suggestions for future research.

2. Person-reference and identity

Numerous researchers have examined person-reference choices linked to the speaker's identity[2]. For instance, the identity of Spanish women was studied by Martín-Rojo (1997), who argued that the pronoun *nosotras* 'we (fem.)' encodes solidarity with other women and is also used to downplay individual responsibility. Similarly, Lerner and Kitzinger (2007) have discussed speakers' formulation and reallocation of individual and collective responsibility through first-person singular and plural forms in English. Person-reference forms may also serve as mitigation and distancing devices. Haverkate (1992), for example, examined the use of, *inter alia*, *we* and the indefinite pronoun *one* within assertive and directive speech acts, pointing out that they 'defocalize' the identity of the speakers. That is: to minimize their role through a distancing technique (p. 516). The author concluded that these forms can serve to mitigate the force of such speech acts.

Regarding person-reference and addressing techniques, Brown and Gilman's (1960) seminal work on power and solidarity relations between interlocutors showed that 'T' forms (familiar, e.g., Spanish *tú*) are used with addressees with less power than the speaker, and 'V' forms (polite, e.g., Spanish *usted*) are used with those with greater power. In a

solidary relationship, 'T' is used reciprocally. More recently, Raymond (2012) studied the second-person singular pronouns *tú* and *vos* used among Salvadorans living in California. He showed that US-born speakers, in contrast with Salvadoran-born speakers, accommodate to the pronominal system of Mexican Spanish, in which *vos* is not used, to establish solidarity and reduce distance (see also Raymond 2016a; 2016b).

Particularly relevant to the present analysis are studies that have examined person-reference and identity in a migration context (e.g. De Fina 2003; De Fina and King 2011). De Fina (2003) studied narratives of Mexican immigrants in Maryland, analyzing their social orientation as demonstrated by pronominal usage. She considered the choice between *yo*, *nosotros*, *tú/usted*, *uno*, and *se* in narrating their personal experiences and argued that the speakers "project a self that is essentially oriented to others" (2003: 65), shown by high frequencies of *nosotros*, which represents speakers as part of a collectivity rather than highlighting their personal/individual identity and experience. Additionally, she found that speakers, when asked about individual experiences, often oriented towards collectiveness, thereby negotiating their identity (e.g. using *nosotros* in response to the interviewer's use of *tú*).

Moreover, she noted that shifts from *yo* to *uno* indicated depersonalization, thus generalizing the speaker's experience from a particular person to immigrants in general. The following example shows a speaker responding with *uno* and *nosotros* to a question in which the interviewer uses *tú*, whereby the speaker depersonalizes and generalizes the experience:

(1)   A: *¿Y **has** tenido alguna experiencia que en cambio te recuerdas como muy buena o no?*
'And have **you** had any experience on the other hand that you remember as very good or not?'

R: (.) *Oh buena porque o sea cuando **uno** encuentra un trabajo,*
'Oh good because I mean when **one** finds a job',
y empieza a ganar dinero este,
'and starts to make money uh'
*eso para **nosotros nos** parece bueno,*
'this for **us** it seems good to **us**'
*porque si **uno** aquí llega y está y se encuentra **uno** que no tiene dónde trabajar…*
'because if **one** gets here, and is and finds **oneself** with no place to work…'

(De Fina 2003: 71)

In (1) the speaker uses *uno* to depersonalize his/her work experience,

conveying that it is general and shared by others. The speaker uses *nosotros* to express that working and making money is good, not only for the speaker but also for immigrants in general (for further discussion of individual/collective reference and identity, see Lerner and Kitzinger 2007).

De Fina and King (2011) also analyzed the language experiences of Latin American migrant women who were living in the Washington D.C. area. Similar to De Fina (2003), this study highlights the impersonal role of *uno* and the agentive role of first-person singular reference, among other aspects of the speakers' identities. In the next section the discursive functions of person-reference forms that are relevant to the present study will be discussed.

2.1. Distancing

Several researchers have examined person-reference choice in terms of distancing (e.g. Maitland and Wilson 1987; Haverkate 1992; Martín-Rojo 1997). For instance, Maitland and Wilson (1987: 498) explain that "[i]ndicating self-reference by means other than *I* or *we* is said to represent a desire on the part of speakers to distance themselves from the topic under discussion, or from the discourse participant himself/herself." They illustrate the use of *one* and *you* as distancing strategies in the following example (p. 501, my bold):

(2)   *Indeed if **one** wants enough resources to do everything we wish to do **you** have to be resolute about the other matters too.*

Moreover, Haverkate (1992: 516) points out that speakers use a distancing technique in order to 'defocalize' their identity and minimize their role. Example 3 illustrates the use of *one* to defocalize speaker identity and also to mitigate assertive force (p. 510, my bold):

(3)   *In this case **one** could suggest that the conditional serves to mitigate the illocutionary force of the utterance.*

Furthermore, Martín-Rojo (1997) highlights the use of *tú* as a distancing strategy. Although distancing is not the main focus of her analysis, the following example clearly illustrates that the speaker is using a distancing technique when talking about both her and other women's work experiences (p. 250, my bold):

(4)   *…que de acuerdo no **te** dan toda la libertad que **tú puedas** tener en el tema profesional por ejemplo, por supuesto que no, que **tú** te lo **tienes** que trabajar…*

'**you** don't get the freedom **you** can have in the professional area, for example, of course not, that **you** have to work for it…'

In addition, the author suggests that the absence of first-person deixis indicates lack of involvement that confers an "appearance of objectivity on discourses" (p. 245). De Fina (2003) discusses distancing in terms of 'depersonalization', whereby the speaker presents an experience as general rather than specific. For example, she highlights that the use of *tú* or *usted* may both generalize and bring the listener into the experience. De Fina (2003: 81-82, my bold) illustrates depersonalization and listener involvement with discourse from a woman using *usted* to discuss her work experience, as seen below:

(5)   M: *Entonces si **Usted** sacaba este trabajo **le** daban más y más*
'So if **you** did the job they gave **you** more and more
*y nunca **veía** ese final!*
'and you never saw the end of it!'

Furthermore, a different type of distancing occurs with third-person referencing, in which the speaker presents a contrastive situation between themselves and others, with whom they do not identify (De Fina 1995). The speaker marks the "other" while indicating that they are not part of a specific group of "others", including such group's behavior or characteristics. De Fina (1995: 393, my bold) illustrates such use in political speech, in which third-person plural reference (referring to *citadinos* 'people of the city') contrasts with first-person plural:

(6)   *__los__ ha conducido a una resaca peor de la situación en que **están**, __necesitamos__ transitar a una situación de compromiso y de construcción democrática*
'it has led **them** to a worse immobility than the one in which **they are** already,
(<u>we</u>) need to shift into a situation of compromise and of democratic construction'

In this case, "[t]he pronominal opposition reveals that *los citadinos* are 'they', a political agent with which the speaker does not identify" (p. 394).

For the present study, both Haverkate's (1992) and De Fina's (2003) conceptions of distancing as a strategy used to defocalize and depersonalize the speaker's identity have been adopted. De Fina's (1995; 2003) ideas that the speaker may be both distancing/depersonalizing herself while simultaneously involving the listener, as well as expressing a contrast and lack of group identification, will also be taken into account.

2.2. Involvement

The notion of involvement is another function of person-reference that can reveal aspects of speaker identity. For example, Chafe (1985: 116, cited by Tannen [2007]) views involvement as "a more psychological, internal state which shows itself in observable linguistic phenomenon" (Tannen 2007: 27). Tannen's (2007) view is similar, describing involvement as "an internal, even emotional connection individuals feel which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories, and words." (p. 27). This description is similar to what Martín-Rojo (1997) observed for *nosotras* 'we (fem.)', suggesting that it expresses subjectivity and personalization. Tannen (1983), like the above-mentioned authors who discuss listener involvement, argues that the use of impersonal *you* can refer to the speaker, but it also "inserts the hearer into the narrative" (p. 368).

From a different perspective, De Fina (1995) distinguishes three aspects of involvement: personal participation in a topic, which implies personalization; commitment to one's words, which implies authorship; and identification or solidarity with others. In her analysis of two political speeches, she identifies them as having high involvement due to their personalized nature, which is evidenced by the use of *I* and *we*. The examples from her study illustrate this involvement:

(7) reality and Chiapas is a moment of reflection for Mexicans in this fashion. There is a specific policy implication that **I** would like to mention and it is a clear, concrete lesson coming from Chiapas:

(De Fina 1995: 408, my bold)

(8) ***hemos** construido una nueva sociedad*
'(**we**) have built a new society'

(9) ***hemos** ido paulatinamente reconstruyendo un nuevo modelo productivo*
'(**we**) have been rebuilding little by little a new model of production.'

(De Fina 1995: 390, my bold)

In (7), the speaker uses *I* to express involvement and in (8) and (9) the speaker is involved by using *nosotros*.

2.2.1. Solidarity

As mentioned above, speakers choose pronouns such as *we* to indicate solidarity (De Fina 1995; Martin-Rojo 1997; De Fina 2003). De Fina (1995) considers solidarity as a type of involvement and highlights the importance of distinguishing between tactical identification with others

from solidarity. She draws from Goffman's (1981) idea of 'production format' and the notion of 'principal' ("an individual, group or social category represented in the speech" [De Fina 1995: 384]), describing solidarity as "a consistent indication by the speaker of the existence of another agent as a principal of the speech, and a principal with whom he/she signals (through pronominal choice and continuity of reference) an organic (as opposed to a tactical) identification" (p. 384). Solidarity is illustrated in example (10), in which the speaker represents himself as part of a group and therefore uses *nosotros* and *nuestras* 'our'. The speaker is talking about Native Latin American organizations, a social group to which he belongs (De Fina 1995: 390, my bold):

(10) *La primera pregunta que nos **hacíamos** era sobre la viabilidad de **nuestras** organizaciones, de **nuestras** comunidades y de **nuestra** existencia misma en la zona.*
'The first question that **we** were asking ourselves was about the feasibility of **our** organizations, of **our** communities and of **our** existence itself in the area.'

Similarly, Martin-Rojo (1997) discusses solidarity and highlights that *nosotras* encodes group membership and identification, which, in the context of her study, is that of women. Moreover, De Fina (2003) highlights the collective identities of Mexican immigrants, describing that they "stress their relationship with the people with whom they came, both because sharing such an important experience creates a bond between them, and because these companions are often the only people that they see and to whom they talk, particularly in the beginning of the immigrant experience" (p. 91). For the present study, solidarity is defined as a type of involvement (following De Fina 1995) indicating group membership and identification with a group (Martín-Rojo 1997) (see also Lerner and Kitzinger 2007 on the use of first-person plural reference to indicate collectivity membership).

2.2.2. Stance-taking

Another strategy I consider to be a type of speaker involvement is that of stance-taking, which has been studied by several researchers (e.g. Biber and Finegan 1988; van Hell et al. 2005; Du Bois 2007). Biber and Finegan, (1988: 1), for instance, define stance as the "overt expression of an author's or speaker's attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitment concerning the message." In other words, stance is viewed as a very subjective way in which speakers use language. Stance is defined by Du Bois (2007: 169) as "a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means (language, gesture, and other sym-

bolic forms), through which social actors simultaneously evaluate objects, position subjects (themselves and others), and align with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of value in the sociocultural field." This researcher has a somewhat more complex view of stance, but it is nevertheless similar to that of Biber and Finegan (1988), since it involves subjective aspects such as evaluation. For example, a speaker may use first-person singular pronouns to express how she/he feels, as in *I'm so glad* or *I'm just amazed* (Du Bois 2007:143, my bold). According to Du Bois, the first-person pronoun indexes the stancetaker and the affective predicate positions the speaker as glad or amazed. In addition, speakers may take an epistemic stance (e.g. *I know* or *I don't know*), presenting themselves as someone with or without knowledge of something (Du Bois 2007: 143). For the present study, I adopt Biber and Finegan's (1988) more general definition of stance, and identify as stance-taking all cases in which the speaker is expressing her/his attitude, feeling, judgement, or commitment. In the following section the methodology for the current analysis will be outlined.

3. Methodology

The data emerge from sociolinguistic interviews collected by the current author with ten Mexican immigrants who either lived or worked in Roswell, Georgia at the time of the interview. Their ages ranged from 25 to 56 and their gender was evenly distributed. Additionally, their average length of residency (LOR) in the U.S. was 13 years, and they had a variety of occupations (see Table 2). The selection of speakers for interviewing was based on the requirements that they be native Spanish-speakers, at least 18 years old, and that they lived or worked in Roswell[3].

Speaker	Occupation	LOR in U.S. / Georgia
F39[4]	Owner of clothing boutique	14/14
M34	Owner of computer repair shop	10/10
F25	Restaurant worker	13/12
M27	Auto body repair	16/16
F56	Owner of tax office	25/25
F52	Owner of sewing shop	2/2
F49	Restaurant worker	7/7
M51	Landscaping	10/ --
M33	Owner of appliance store	12/11
M43	Carpenter	25/10

Table 2. *Speakers' occupations and LOR*

The interviews ranged from 30 minutes to one hour. In order to introduce the topic at hand, the present analysis involves responses to the same question: *¿Qué tan difícil o fácil es que la gente se adapte a la vida en Roswell cuando se muda aquí de otro país?* 'How difficult or easy is it for people to adapt to life in Roswell when they move here from another country?'. I first located and analyzed various person-reference forms in context. I analyzed impersonal forms including *uno*, impersonal *se*, and impersonal *tú*, as well as personal pronouns including *yo*, *tú*, *nosotros*, *él* 'he', *ella* 'she', and *ellos* 'they' along with their null forms. Furthermore, I analyzed lexical noun phrases (e.g. *hispanos* 'Hispanics', *personas* 'people'). Following De Fina (1995), in addition to forms in subject position, object pronouns (e.g. *me* 'me', *nos* 'us') and possessive forms (*mi* 'my', *nuestro* 'our') were also included. After locating the referential expressions, I calculated the overall frequencies of each form in the interviews, identified them as personal or impersonal forms, and also determined what each form expressed in terms of identity, that is, social orientation and positioning of the speakers in each particular discourse context. Specifically, I coded each token for the two primary categories of distancing and involvement in relation to person-reference as highlighted in the literature review. Within each of these two categories, I also identified numerous subcategories: distancing included (a) distancing + listener involvement, (b) general distancing, and (c) lack of group identification; involvement included (a) general involvement, (b) listener involvement, (c) other person involvement, (d) solidarity, and (e) stance-taking. General involvement included any token that did not fit into the other subcategories of involvement. Each of these categories are contextually illustrated in the next section, in which I present the results of the present study.

4. Results

4.1. Overall frequencies

The analysis of the ten speakers in the sample resulted in a total of 236 cases of person-reference forms. Table 3 below shows each of the expressions that were identified in the data along with their overall counts and frequencies. As seen below, first-person singular forms are the most frequent (36% of all cases), and first-person plural is one of the least frequent (9%). This is not surprising given that the data consist of one-on-one interviews and treat topics related to the speakers' personal experiences. However, it is interesting to note that

the interview question ('How difficult or easy is it for people to adapt to life here?') made reference to people in general, and not specifically to the interviewee. It appears, then, that the speakers tended to choose to talk about themselves and their own individual and personal experiences more often than a collective or shared experience. However, it is important to note that besides *nosotros*, the impersonal *tú* (used 14% of the time) and impersonal *uno* (used 9% of the time) can also be used to refer to the speaker and to convey a shared experience, so combining these three forms (*nosotros* + impersonal *tú* + *uno* = 32%) reveals similar frequencies when expressing both collective and individual identities. This observation is consistent with that of De Fina (2003), who argued that both *nosotros* and depersonalizing constructions demonstrated an identity that is oriented towards others. In considering the sole comparison of *yo* and *nosotros*, however, there is a divergence in that these two frequencies were equal in De Fina's (2003:66) analysis (34% for both forms) but rather unequal in the present study. This difference could be due to the discourse type –narrative- analyzed by De Fina (2003). The least frequent form used in the present study was impersonal *se*, of which only 3 cases (1%) appeared in the data. Additionally, third-person forms were rather frequent (32%); these were cases in which the speakers involved other people in their experiences and, in some cases, distanced themselves from others. In the next section I discuss personal vs. impersonal forms.

Person-reference	Count	Percentage
First-person singular		
Yo overt	40/236	17%
Yo null	30/236	13%
Me/mí	9/236	4%
Mi(s)	5/236	2%
TOTAL first-person singular reference	84/236	36%
First-person plural		
Nosotros overt	1/236	0.4%
Nosotros null	15/236	6%
Nos/nosotros as object	3/236	1%
Nuestro(a)(s)	3/236	1%
TOTAL first-person plural reference	22/236	9%
Second-person singular		
Tú overt	3/236	1%
Tú null	21/236	9%
Te	7/236	3%
Tu	3/236	1%
TOTAL second-person singular reference	34/236	14%
Impersonal *uno*	22/236	9%
Third-person (singular/ plural)		
Ellos overt	1/236	0.4%
Ellos null	28/236	12%
Él overt	6/236	3%
Él null	0/236	0%
Ella overt	1/236	0.4%
Ella null	1/236	0.4%
Lo(s)/Le(s)	7/236	3%
Su(s)	13/236	6%
Lexical NPs	18/236	8%
TOTAL Third-person reference	75/236	32%
Impersonal *se*	3/236	1%

Table 3. *Frequencies of person-reference*

4.2. Personal vs. impersonal forms

Out of the 236 occurrences of referential forms, 127 (54%) were personal forms and 109 (46%) were impersonal. The impersonal forms identified include *uno*, *se*, *tú*, *ellos* (non-specific) (including null and object pronoun/possessive forms) and non-specific lexical NPs (e.g. *personas*). All other forms, primarily *yo*, *nosotros*, *ellos* (specific) and

specific lexical NPs (e.g. *mi hijo* 'my son') were identified as personal forms. Regarding impersonal forms, speakers were not explicitly referring to someone in particular, but in many cases were talking about their own personal experiences which were also the experiences of others. This is illustrated with the use of *un hispano* and *uno* in (11) where the speaker is saying that the experience moving to and adapting to life in Roswell is very difficult for Hispanics because one has to leave their traditions:

(11) *es un tema bien bien difícil por, de explicar porque sí es muy difícil, ah desafortunadamente porque primero lo, cuando* **un hispano** *viene, a Roswell a vivir, tiene que dejar* **uno** *sus tradiciones y costumbres, no todas pueden estar aquí compactadas* [M34]
'it's a pretty pretty difficult topic because of, to explain because it is difficult, ah unfortunately because first, when **a Hispanic** comes, to Roswell to live, **one** has to leave their traditions and customs, not all of them can be here compressed'

Additionally, the reference to *un hispano* illustrates the use of 'membership categorization devices' (MCDs, Sacks 1972). MCDs refer to a collection of identity categories (e.g. man, nurse, parent) along with typical activities or behavior associated with those categories (see, e.g., Schegloff 2007a; 2007b). The speaker in (11) is generalizing the experience of Hispanics and saying, first of all, that it is typical for Hispanic speakers in particular to immigrate to Roswell (the interview question was simply about people coming from another country in general) and, secondly, to give up their traditions. Furthermore, the speaker is including himself in the category of Hispanic speakers.

As noted above, impersonal *tú* can also be used to generalize the experience, including both the speaker and others with similar experiences as seen in (12):

(12) *este, mira es, es, complicado, es complicado, y sencillo a la vez, complicado ¿por qué? porque,* **vienes** *de una cultura, en donde, en* **tu** *barrio,* **tienes**, *relación con todos,* **ves, ves** *a la gente en las calles, haciendo su vida caminando yendo a comprar este, cosas para comer, hay,* **ves** *mucha vida* [M33]
'ah, look it's, complicated, it's complicated and simple at the same time, complicated why? Because **you come** from a culture where, in **your** neighborhood, **you have**, connection with everyone, **you see**, **you see** people in the streets, going about their life walking going to buy ah, things to eat, there is, **you see** a lot of life'

In this example, the speaker is discussing his own cultural experiences in Mexico while simultaneously conveying, through the impersonal *tú*, that other people that are part of his culture share the experience, thereby depersonalizing it. Further, in (13) the speaker is describing the purpose of Hispanic immigrants in coming to Roswell. As in (11) the speaker uses MCDs (*hispanos*, *inmigrantes*), this time to indicate that Hispanic immigrants, as part of their category, immigrate in order to work, and how that work becomes their life. Simultaneously, the impersonal *tú* encodes that the speaker is included in this experience.

(13) *como muchos **hispanos** o **inmigrantes**, la idea de venir aquí es venir a trabajar, eso es, se convierte en **tu** vida* [M33]
  'like many **Hispanics** or **immigrants**, the idea of coming here is to come to work, that's it, it becomes **your** life'

Thus, on one hand, the identity of the abovementioned speakers is depersonalized and generalized -it is not presented as unique to the individual-, but, on the other hand, it is constructed as personal, since the speakers themselves share such experiences. The above examples mirror what De Fina (2003) observed in that speakers use impersonal forms in a way that reveals that their immigrant experiences are shared by others.

Concerning personal referential forms, such as *yo* and *nosotros*, the speakers were, unlike in the case of impersonal forms, referring to specific entities. In addition, in using these forms speakers again were talking about their personal experiences. However, they were conveyed as either specific to the individual (*yo*) or as a collective unit (*nosotros*). Both cases are illustrated below:

(14) ***yo vivía** en Doraville en ese tiempo, **tenía** que agarrar el tren para ir hasta el Downtown, para, para chequeo de, médico eh, para **mí** fue muy difícil esa, esa parte porque **yo estaba** embarazada y no **sabía**, ni, por dónde caminar o no, o sea, como na- cuando, cuando no <u>conoces</u> a nadie ni, no <u>sabes</u> qué hacer tie- <u>tienes</u> que buscarle, preguntar…* [F56]
  '**I lived** in Doraville at that time, **I had** to catch the train to go downtown, for, for a medical checkup, ah, for **me** that part was very difficult because **I was** pregnant and **I** didn't even **know** where to walk or not, I mean, since when, when <u>you don't know</u> anyone <u>nor do you know</u> what to do <u>you have</u> to search, ask… '

(15) *Creo que aquí es uno de los lugares más fáciles porque, la mayoría **hablamos** español, como que, si **vamos** a Gwinett o **vamos** a Marietta, son lugares donde casi no hablan español que <u>tú</u>*

99

> *tienes, muy difícil comunicarte con alguien, a mí me ha pasado que he ido a otros, lugares y, hay personas que no entienden ni lo que la cajera le está explicando o lo que le está diciendo, y yo me gusta ayudar y yo les digo, "no te preocupes yo te ayudo"…*[F25]
>
> 'I think that this is one of the easiest places because, the majority of **us speak** Spanish, like, if **we go** to Gwinnett or **we go** to Marietta, they are places where they barely speak Spanish, that **you have**, very difficult to communicate with someone, it has happened to **me** that **I've gone** to other, places and, there are people that don't even understand what the cashier is explaining to them or what she/he is saying to them, and **I like** to help and **I tell** them, "don't worry, **I'll help** you"

In (14) a very individualized and personal experience is narrated by the speaker through the use of *yo* (as well as *mi*). She is telling about a very difficult time in which she was pregnant and had to take the train to get a medical checkup. But notice at the end there is a switch from *yo* to impersonal *tú*. At this point, she depersonalizes and generalizes her experience as being shared by others. This shows how speakers switch from personal to impersonal forms in the same discourse turn, thereby generalizing their experiences, a pattern also observed by De Fina (2003). Example (15) shows the use of *nosotros* to portray the speaker as part of a collective unit and to show her identification with a group. Again, we see that speakers often make referential switches. In this example, the speaker switches first to *tú* and then to *yo* to tell me about a unique experience she had helping someone who could not understand English.

In addition to switches, self-repairs (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977), though not very frequent, were also reflected in the interviews. The following example illustrates two instances in which the speaker first uses *yo* but then immediately switches to *nosotros*. De Fina (2003) explains self-repairs as a type of negotiation of identity by the speaker[5]. Additionally, Lerner and Kitzinger (2007: 536) describe them as "aggregating an individual to a collective reference" when speaking particularly about 'I' to 'we' self-repairs in English. In (16), the speaker is negotiating between an individual and collective identity when she describes where she stayed after first arriving to the US, as something she personally experienced but that was also shared by others. This example could also be interpreted as a "wrong referent" case in which the speaker repairs in order to indicate her intended referent (Hepburn, Wilkinson, and Shaw 2012: 176).

(16) *cuando **yo llegué**, **llegué** a casa de **mis** hermanos, no, no **puedo** decir que **yo sufrí** como otras personas que no tienen ni donde*

> *dormir,* **yo tenía** *por lo menos,* <u>*dormíamos*</u> *en el piso, en la, la carpeta pero* **dormía,** <u>*teníamos*</u> *un techo, eh, en ah, cuando, cuando* **yo quise** *est- trabajar, eh fue difícil para* **mí...** [F56]
> 'when **I arrived**, **I arrived** at **my** brothers'/siblings' house, **I can't** say that **I suffered** like other people that don't even have a place to sleep, **I had** at least, <u>we slept</u> on the floor, on the, the carpet but **I slept**, <u>we had</u> a roof, uh, in uh, when, when **I tried** to work, ah it was difficult for **me**...'

4.3. Discursive functions and strategies

The two primary discursive functions and strategies identified in the present data were the following: distancing (which includes general distancing, or a 'defocalizing'/minimization of speaker role, distancing + listener involvement, and lack of group identification) and involvement (which includes general involvement, listener involvement, other person involvement, solidarity, and stance-taking). Distancing was observed in 87 cases (37%), with general distancing occurring a total of 33 times (14%), distancing + listener involvement occurring 30 times (13%), and lack of group identification occurring 24 times (10%). With regard to involvement, speakers used person-referencing for this function in 149 cases (63%). Out of these cases: 49 were general involvement (21%), 39 other person involvement (17%), 35 stance-taking (15%), 23 solidarity (10%), and 3 listener involvement (1%). Therefore, involvement was the leading function/strategy in the present data. Each function will be discussed and illustrated in the following sections.

4.3.1. Involvement

With regards to involvement, the speakers in the present data used a variety of strategies. For instance, stance-taking was observed among five of the speakers. As noted above, stance-taking refers to the expression of the speaker's attitude, feelings, judgement, or commitment. First-person reference indexes the stancetaker, and affective predicates position the speaker as feeling a certain way (Du Bois 2007). The following example illustrates stance-taking with first-person singular forms and the verbs *saber* 'know', *sentir* 'feel', and *querer* 'want':

(17) *pero* **yo sé** *que a otras personas, se les hace mucho más difícil por el idioma, aparte de, de, de lo demás, o sea, yo veo personas que van a, iban a una tienda a comprar groceries, tenían que poner a niños a que les tradujeran, yo veía y, y, y* **yo sentía** *que, como que forzar a un niño a, a, a estar el intérprete como que, no era*

> *el lugar ¿no? pero, eh yo, yo qui-* **yo no quise** *que mis hijos, pasaran por esas necesidades* [F56]
> 'but **I know** that for other people, it is much more difficult for them because of the language, apart from, from, from everything else, I mean, I see people that go to, they would go to a store to buy groceries, they had to have children translate for them, I would see and, and **I felt** that, forcing a child to, to, to be the interpreter like, it wasn't the place right? but, ah, I, **I didn't want** my children to deal with those necessities'

The use of *yo sé* 'I know' shows epistemic stance-taking as the speaker is conveying that she has knowledge of other people struggling with the English language. The uses of *yo sentía* 'I felt' and *yo no quise* 'I didn't want' index the speaker as the stancetaker (*yo*), and the semantics of *sentir* and *querer* conveys the speaker's feelings and desires, or stance. In (18), stance-taking is demonstrated with the verb *afectar* 'affect' and the object pronoun *me*. Here the speaker evaluates his experience at school, saying that not interacting with native English speakers affected him negatively. He then uses the first person singular of the verb 'to know' *saber*, to convey epistemic stance-taking, saying that he didn't know how to speak English:

(18) *yo en la escuela nunca hablé con un americano quizás, con un moreno o con otra persona que no fuera de México o hispano, y eso* **me afectó** *bastante porque, cinco años y no había, la,* **yo no sabía** *hablar inglés* [M27]
'At school I never talked to an American perhaps, with a black person or with another person that wasn't from Mexico or Hispanic, and that affected **me** quite a bit because, five years and there wasn't, the, **I didn't** know how to speak English'

Other verbs that showed stance-taking were *gustar* 'like', *pensar* 'think', and *creer* 'believe' and were also used with first-person singular reference. These examples reflect the subjective nature of stance-taking pointed out in previous studies (e.g. Biber and Finegan 1988; Du Bois 2007).

Moreover, solidarity was another type of involvement conveyed by the speakers' choice in person-reference, specifically the choice to use first-person plural forms as seen in (19) below:

(19) *el transporte, también es, la forma en como se hace el transporte es un poco diferente a* **nuestras** *comunidades este, eh, aquí en esta ciudad de Roswell es cada, veinticinco minutos...* [M34]
'transportation, is also, the way in which transportation is done

is a little bit different to **our** communities umm, uh, here in the city of Roswell it's every, twenty-five minutes…'

The speaker identifies himself as part of a community, by using *nuestras*, referring specifically to the Latino or Mexican communities. Similarly, in (20) below (a partial repetition of (14) above) the speaker is conveying identification with a group by using *nosotros*:

(20) *Creo que aquí es uno de los lugares más fáciles porque, la mayoría **hablamos** español, como que, si **vamos** a Gwinett o **vamos** a Marietta, son lugares donde casi no hablan español* [F25]
'I think that this is one of the easiest places because, the majority of **us speak** Spanish, like, if **we go** to Gwinnett or **we go** to Marietta, they are places where they barely speak Spanish'

What is interesting about this example is that the speaker identifies herself with both the Roswell and the Latino communities, positioning herself as part of one community but not part of another, given that in other cities "*casi no hablan español*" 'they barely speak Spanish.' This use of the third-person plural is used to distance herself from those who do not speak Spanish (see section 4.3.2 for further examples of third-person reference and distancing). Moreover, the speaker could have chosen the third-person singular form *habla* instead of *hablamos* given that the subject is *la mayoría* (both verbs are grammatically correct). Her choice of the first-person plural, however, expresses a solidarity with the Roswell community that the third-person singular does not.

Example (21) is another illustration of solidarity. In this case, the speaker also uses an MCD (see section 4.2 above), "*los mexicanos*", to explain what he views as typical behavior of Mexicans in the community ("*nos encerramos*"). In using the first-person plural (*nosotros*), the speaker includes himself in the category "Mexicans" and also points out that he as well as Mexicans in general share this behavior. Thus, in using *los mexicanos* as an MCD the speaker is not simply referring, but is categorizing (see Schegloff 2007b).

(21) *bueno yo hablando de, **los mexicanos nosotros nos encerramos** como que, nos, hacemos menos quizás, y deberíamos en vez de hacernos menos tratar de, de salir…* [M27]
'Well I, talking about, **Mexicans we close ourselves off** like, we keep to ourselves perhaps, and we should instead of keeping to ourselves try to, to go out…'

The above uses of first-person plural to indicate identification with a group is in line with previous research (e.g. Martín-Rojo 1997; De Fina 2003; Lerner and Kitzinger 2007; De Fina and King 2011).

Furthermore, other person's involvement, as well as listener's, were observed when the speakers referred to other people or to the listener (see 22):

(22) *ah **te** repito que aquí tenemos este, Roswell tiene, pues las bibliotecas, las escuelas, los centros de, ayuda este médica, ah y la mayor parte de la comunidad este, pues ya es hispana entonces no es difícil por el idioma los taxistas por ejemplo, pues en **su** mayoría **son** hispanos* [F39]
    'uh I repeat to **you** that here we have ah, Roswell has, well the libraries, the schools, the centers of, uh, medical help, uh and the greater part of the community uh, well now is Hispanic so it's not difficult because of the language the taxi drivers for example, well in **their** majority they **are** Hispanics'

Here the speaker is referring specifically to the listener with *te* as well as referring to other people in the community, including taxi drivers, with the uses of *su* 'their' and *son* '(they) are'. Finally, any case of involvement that did not fit into the above categories was considered general involvement and is illustrated below by the use of overt and null *yo* to express speaker involvement:

(23) *no, aquí se, yo, **yo estaba** en, en Florida, y no me gustó por el cru- el clima, **me tuve** que regresar para acá para Roswell, porque me gustó el clima, eh, me gustó, las tiendas, todas las tiendas las tienen más cerca* [M51]
    'no, here, I, **I was** in, in Florida, and I didn't like it because of the the weather, **I had** to come back here to Roswell, because I liked the weather, uh, I liked, the stores, all the stores they have them closer'

4.3.2. Distancing

Concerning distancing strategies, the speakers often used impersonal *tú* and *uno* to depersonalize and generalize their experiences. In the case of impersonal *tú*, the speaker additionally brought the listener into the experience (see Tannen 1983; De Fina 2003), as seen in (24).

(24) *y en otros que- estados no, **tienes** que tener carro **tienes** que tener* [ininteligible] *mover**te** y acá, aquí puedo ir caminando*

> *a mi apartamento y no hay problema, así es, la situación* [M51]
> 'and in other that, states no, **you have** to have a car **you have** to have [unintelligible] to get **yourself** around and here, here I can walk to my apartment and it's no problems, that's how the situation is'

The speaker is talking about his experience living outside of Georgia, but is also including the listener and generalizing the experience[6]. In other cases, speakers often use *uno* for general distancing that does not necessarily involve the listener. In (25), *uno* is most frequent but the speaker also switches to impersonal *tú* in order to include the listener:

(25) *pero no hay nada a lo que **uno** no se acostumbre, así como **te acostumbras** a los este comodo- comodidades del centro pues también se puede **uno** acom- adaptar al este, al lugar donde **uno** esté, o sea no es lo mismo pero sí sí se puede, adaptar **uno*** [F49]
'but there's nothing that **one** doesn't get used to, just like **you get used to** the, uh, amenities of downtown well **one** can also adapt to ah, to the place where **one** is, I mean it's not the same thing but yeah, **one** can adapt'

As mentioned above, although speakers are referring to their own experience, *uno* encodes distancing and also generalizes their experiences as being shared by others. In (25), the speaker is saying that adapting to life in Roswell was certainly possible for her and others. These examples illustrate and support the concepts of 'defocalization' and depersonalization discussed in previous research (e.g. Haverkate 1992; De Fina 2003) and also support Maitland and Wilson's (1987) explanation that pronouns besides *I* and *we* can represent distancing.

Interestingly, a subsequent analysis of demographic factors such as age, gender, and LOR further revealed some tendencies concerning which speakers distanced themselves more (or less) often by using impersonal forms[7]. Overall, younger speakers (25-34 years old) distanced themselves more often than older speakers (41% *vs.* 15%, respectively). This coincides with Dieck's study of Colombian Spanish (2016), where she observed that the younger generation used more impersonal forms. The opposite was found, however, by Flores-Ferrán (2009) in her analysis of *uno* whereby its use increased as speakers got older. Regarding gender, males distanced themselves more often (49%) than females (7%), which is consistent with both Dieck (2016) and Flores-Ferrán (2009). Finally, LOR showed the following tendency: Those with shorter LORs (2-13 years) distanced themselves more often

than those with longer LORs (16-25 years) (38% vs. 7%, respectively). To my knowledge, this finding had not been discussed in the previous research, and it is unclear at this time what this tendency might suggest. Likewise, the observations for age and gender in previous studies lack explanation, and further research is required.

Furthermore, as noted above, distancing can occur through third-person referencing to indicate lack of group identification. The following examples illustrate the third-person (*personas, gente*) as a distancing strategy to indicate the "other" group and that the speakers do not lack understanding of English, the desire to assimilate, think that Americans are above them, or struggle with English, respectively:

(26) *he ido a otros, lugares y, hay **personas** que no **entienden** ni lo que la cajera le está explicando* [F25]
'I've gone to other, places and, there are **people** that don't even **understand** what the cashier is explaining to them'

(27) *yo he conocido **gente**, que no **se integra**, y no **se quieren integrar**, porque **piensan** que el americano es, está, muy arriba de **ellos*** [F52]
'I've known **people**, that don't **assimilate**, and **they don't want to assimilate**, because **they think** that Americans are, are, high above **them'**

(28) *pero yo sé que a otras **personas**, se **les** hace mucho más difícil por el idioma* [F56]
'but I know that for other **people**, it is much more difficult for **them** because of the language'

5. Discussion and conclusion

In the present study, I have carried out an analysis of speaker identity as evidenced through person-referencing among ten Mexican immigrants in Georgia. From the perspective of positioning theory, I have examined the social orientation of speakers and to what degree they position themselves as either personal/individualistic, impersonal/general, or collective with respect to others.

In terms of overall frequencies, the first-person singular forms are the most frequent in the data (36%), which is not surprising given the type of discourse and speech events. While it seems that this finding points to a more individualized and personal identity overall, it must be noted that the combination of frequencies of *nosotros,* impersonal *tú* and *uno* (32%) –person-reference forms that include others and make one's identity more collective and generalized– is very similar to the fre-

quency of the first-person singular forms. Thus, the speakers in the present data construct their identities as both individual, highlighting their personal roles, as well as collective, emphasizing their relationships and experiences with others.

Regarding personal vs. impersonal forms, personal forms were slightly favored over impersonal forms (54% and 46%, respectively). It is important to highlight that speakers use impersonal expressions to minimize their role and to make non-specific reference. But, at the same time, they talked about their own personal experiences, albeit indirectly. Impersonal forms were typically used to depersonalize the speakers' identities and to generalize their experiences of accommodating to life in Georgia. In contrast, personal forms made reference to specific entities such as *I* or *we* and were used to reflect either individual or collective identities. Additionally, speakers made switches back and forth between personal and impersonal forms and showed self-repairs, thereby negotiating their identities, a strategy reported by De Fina (2003).

Finally, the main discursive strategies and functions identified in person-referencing were involvement and distancing. Speakers used forms that conveyed involvement in 63% of all cases and distancing 37% of the time. Speakers showed that they were involved or were involving other people by means of stance-taking, solidarity, other-person involvement, as well as general involvement (the use of *yo* or *nosotros* that did not convey stance-taking or solidarity). Concerning distancing, speakers often used impersonal forms that showed a depersonalization and a generalization of the experience, which sometimes consisted of bringing the listener into the conversation, for example, in the case of the impersonal *tú*. But why would speakers distance themselves? Perhaps to avoid an individual identity and to focus more on their migration experience as being something that is not unique to themselves, but rather something many people go through. When taking into account demographic factors, it was observed that younger speakers, males, and those with shorter LORs distanced themselves more frequently, although further research would be required to analyze these tendencies in depth. In addition to distancing, the avoidance of individual identity is shown through their solidarity with others as encoded by the *nosotros* form. Moreover, speakers sometimes used third-person reference to convey distance in terms of lack of group identification, contrasting their own behavior with others. Third-person references were also used as MCDs (e.g. *hispanos*, *inmigrantes*).

The above findings suggest that speakers in the Southeastern U.S. (or at least in Georgia) tend to construct their identities individually and collectively. Comparing with data from other U.S. regions (e.g. De Fina 2003 [Maryland]; De Fina and King 2011 [Washington D.C]), mostly

similarities are observed concerning immigrant identities. In general, the use of particular person-reference forms at times positioned the speakers as individuals, and other times as part of a group. Impersonal forms, for example, were used to show that their immigration experience was not unique and was shared by others (De Fina 2003). The present data agree with that of De Fina (2003), since they both illustrate discourse that "reflects a social conception of the individual, where the individual views himself as surrounded by others" (p. 90). The use of impersonal *tú*, *uno*, and *nosotros* in the current data demonstrate such discourse. One major difference observed, specifically in the case of Maryland speakers (De Fina 2003), was quantitative: Georgian speakers used *nosotros* only 9% of the time while Maryland speakers used it 34% of the time. The reason for this divergence, potentially due to discourse genre differences between the two studies, is unclear at this time. Frequencies of first-person singular forms, however, were very comparable (36%, Georgia; 34%, Maryland), making the number of cases where speakers displayed their agentive and personal role very similar. Additionally similarities are found with speakers from De Fina and King's (2011) study in Washington, D.C., namely that they expressed a sense of division and isolation from Americans and a desire to interact with them. Secondly, they expressed that a lack of English competence can be an obstacle for such relationships. In the current data, however, comments about isolation and lack of English knowledge were mostly used to reflect the attitudes of other Hispanic immigrants and not the speakers themselves.

More generally, the data revealed several insights about the immigration experience in Georgia. First, when answering the main interview question, speakers varied in their responses. Some thought adapting to life in Georgia is generally difficult for reasons such as giving up their traditions, getting around, and finding work. Others said it is easy because many people in Roswell speak Spanish. Secondly, the speakers tend to view English competence and cultural assimilation as important and valuable. One speaker highlighted how not interacting with English speakers negatively affected him. Other speakers, as previously stated, frame their discourse as an opposition between themselves and the "other", positioning themselves far from other immigrants who do not speak English or who do not wish to integrate. Finally, the social context of Roswell as being a city with a high Hispanic population led speakers to think specifically of Hispanics when answering the general interview question (e.g. *cuando un **hispano** viene aquí; es uno de los lugares más fáciles porque la mayoría **hablamos español***). That is, their conception of immigration to Roswell is one in which it is Hispanics who immigrate.

An interesting note on using the term *hispano*: in my view, the use of this term by Mexicans is directly related to their migration experience. It is an ethnic group marker, indicating that the speakers are part of a larger group aside from Mexicans (e.g. Colombians, Guatemalans, etc.) (see De Fina 2003 for a similar discussion of *hispano*). The speakers could have used *mexicano*, but mostly used *hispano* to connect their own experiences with the migration experience of Spanish-speakers at large and is a term that most likely would not have been used in Mexico where they were generally not surrounded with other Spanish-speaking groups. Such use of a more general identity term by marginalized groups to forge a collective identity refers to what Spivak (1987) calls 'strategic essentialism.'

To sum up, the present observations regarding frequencies, personal vs. impersonal forms, and involvement and distancing provide further support to previous research that has treated person-reference and identity. In addition, they provide a synthesis of different strategies cited by numerous authors. Nonetheless, further research is certainly required. It would be useful for future studies to consider the overt vs. null subject pronoun distinction (see, e.g., Flores-Ferrán 2002; Travis 2007; Raymond 2015) in relation to degrees of involvement as well as to include non-person-reference, such as spatial deixis. Future research would also benefit from a deeper analysis of personal/impersonal switches, demographic factors, and individual speaker variation as well as a larger data sample. All of these factors would contribute to a more complete picture of person-reference and identity in Spanish.

Philip P. Limerick
Department of Romance Languages
University of Georgia
30602 – Athens, GA – USA
nztm@uga.edu
ORCID: 0000-0003-2271-2175

Notes

[1] Although the term '*pronominal* choice' is used by some authors, the broader term 'person-reference' is more accurate here since in many cases the overt pronoun is omitted (i.e. pro-drop cases) and, additionally, lexical noun phrases are under analysis.

[2] In addition to the references cited in this section and throughout the paper, see also, e.g., Gardin (1976), Wilson (1990), and Stewart (2003).

[3] Due to IRB conditions, I was unable to work with anyone under 18 years of age.

[4] These labels indicate the gender and age of the speakers.

[5] Similar to self-repairs, Martín-Rojo (1997: 246) observed instances of what she calls 'readjustments' where speakers shifted from third-person (*les*) to first-person pronouns

(*nos*) to indicate that they belong to a group. See also Raymond (2012, 2016b) for dis-
cussion of *tú/vos* self-repair.

[6] The use of spatial deixis (e.g. Fillmore 1997) in (24) with the references *acá/aquí* is also
related to identity in that the speaker positions himself as having an experience in
Georgia that contrasts that of people in other states. However, spatial deixis is outside
the scope of the present study and will be left for future research.

[7] These are simply tendencies and not statistically significant findings. Further research
with a larger data set is needed in order to perform statistical analyses.

Acknowledgements

References

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1988. "Adverbial Stance Types in English". *Discourse Processes*, 11. 1-34.

Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman. 1960. "The pronouns of power and solidarity". In: *Style in Language*, Thomas Sebeok (ed.), 253–276. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Carter, Phillip M. 2005. "Quantifying rhythmic differences between Spanish, English, and Hispanic English". In: *Theoretical and Experimental Approaches to Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the 34th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, Randall Gess (ed.), 63-75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Carter, Phillip M. 2014. "National Narratives, Institutional Ideologies, and Local Talk: The Discursive Production of Spanish in a 'New' US Latino Community". *Language in Society*, 43:2. 209-240.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1985. "Linguistic differences produced by differences between speaking and writing". In: *Literacy, Language, and Learning: The Nature and Consequences of Reading and Writing*, David R. Olson, Nancy Torrance and Angela Hildyard (eds.), 105-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, Bronwyn and Rom Harré. 1990. "Positioning: The Social Construction of Selves". *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20. 43-63.

De Fina, Ana. 1995. "Pronominal Choice, Identity, and Solidarity in Political Discourse". *Text*, 15:3. 379-410.

De Fina, Ana. 2003. *Identity in narrative: A study of immigrant discourse*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

De Fina, Ana and Kendall A. King. 2011. "Language Problem or Language Conflict? Narratives of Immigrant Women's Experiences in the US". *Discourse Studies*, 13:2. 163-188.

Dieck, Marianne. 2016. "'¿Y qué más hace uno, pues?': la expresión de la impersonalidad en el español de Medellín". *Lingüística y Literatura*, 69. 145-175.

Du Bois, John W. 2007. "The stance triangle". In: *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*, Robert Englebretson (ed.), 139-182. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1997. *Lectures on deixis*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Flores-Ferrán, Nydia. 2002. *A sociolinguistic perspective on the use of subject personal pronouns in Spanish narratives of Puerto Ricans in New York City*. Munich: Lincom-Europa.

Flores-Ferrán, Nydia. 2009. "Are You Referring to Me? The Variable Use of UNO and YO in Oral Discourse". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41:9. 1810-1824.

Gardin, Bernard. 1976. "Discours Patronal et Discours Syndical". *Langages*, 41. 47-78.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. "Footing". In: *Forms of Talk*, Erving Goffman (ed.), 124-153. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Haverkate, Henk. 1992. "Deictic Categories as Mitigating Devices". *Pragmatics*, 2:4. 505-522.

Hepburn, Alexa, Sue Wilkinson, and Rebecca Shaw. 2012. "Repairing Self- and Recipient Reference". *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45:2. 175-190.

Lerner, Gene H. and Celia Kitzinger. 2007. "Extraction and Aggregation in the Repair of Individual and Collective Self-Reference". *Discourse Studies*, 9:4. 526-557.

Limerick, Philip P. 2017. "Language Contact in the US Southeast: The Case of Spanish Subject Expression in an Emerging Bilingual Community in Georgia". *Spanish in Context*, 14:1. 53-77.

Maitland, Karen and John Wilson. 1987. "Pronominal Selection and Ideological Conflict". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11:4. 495-512.

Martín-Rojo, Luisa. 1997. "The politics of gender: Agency and self-reference in women's discourse". In: *Political Linguistics*, Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen (eds.), 231-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Montes-Alcalá, Cecilia and Lindsey Sweetnich. 2014. "Español en el sureste de EEUU: el papel de las actitudes lingüísticas en el mantenimiento o pérdida de la lengua." *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, 12:23. 77-92.

Raymond, Chase Wesley. 2012. "Reallocation of Pronouns through Contact: In-the-Moment Identity Construction amongst Southern California Salvadorans". *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16:5. 669-690.

Raymond, Chase Wesley. 2015. "Questions and Responses in Spanish Monolingual and Spanish-English Bilingual Conversation. *Language & Communication*, 42. 50-68.

Raymond, Chase Wesley. 2016a. "Reconceptualizing identity and context in the deployment of forms of address". In: *Forms of Address in the Spanish of the Americas*, María Irene Moyna and Susana Rivera-Mills (eds.), 267-288. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Raymond, Chase Wesley. 2016b. "Linguistic Reference in the Negotiation of Identity and Action: Revisiting the T/V Distinction". *Language*, 92:3. 636-670.

Sacks, Harvey. 1972. "On the analyzability of stories by children". In: *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.), 325–345. New York: Rinehart Winston.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. "The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation". *Language*, 53. 361-382.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007a. "A Tutorial on Membership Categorization". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39. 462-482.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007b. "Categories in Action: Person Reference and Membership Categorization". *Discourse Studies*, 9. 433-461.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1987. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. Taylor and Francis.

Stewart, Miranda. 2003. "'Pragmatic Weight' and Face: Pronominal Presence and the Case of the Spanish Second Person Singular Subject Pronoun *Tú*". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35:2. 91-206.

Tannen, Deborah. 1983. "'I Take Out the Rock-Dok!': How Greek Women Tell About Being Molested (and Create Involvement)". *Anthropological Linguistics*, 25:3. 359-374.

Tannen, Deborah. 2007. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. 2nd ed. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

111

Travis, Catherine E. 2007. "Genre Effects on Subject Expression in Spanish: Priming in Narrative and Conversation". *Language Variation and Change*, 19. 101-135.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2010a. Census of Population. *Demographics & Population, 2010*. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/0P7SD9>.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2010b. American Fact Finder. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/edU10X>.

van Hell, Janet G., Ludo Verhoeven, Marjan Tak, and Moniek van Oosterhout. 2005. "To Take a Stance: A Developmental Study of the Use of Pronouns and Passives in Spoken and Written Narrative and Expository Texts in Dutch". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37:2. 239-273.

Wilson, Anna. 2013. "Stories of Roswell, Georgia: A sociolinguistic study of narrative structure". Undergraduate honors thesis, University of Georgia.

Wilson, Anna. 2014. "Testing the limits of orthogonality: A study of the interaction between lexical frequency and independent variables". *Indiana University Linguistics Club Working Papers special volume. Quantitative approaches to the study of sociolinguistic phenomena across Spanish varieties*.

Wilson, John. 1990. *Politically speaking*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wolfram, Walt, Mary E. Kohn, and Erin Callahan-Price. 2011. "Southern-bred Hispanic English: An emerging socioethnic variety". In: *Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, Jim Michnowicz and Robin Dodsworth (eds.), 1-13. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.