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SUMMARY

The present study explores the effects of English on the minority language of Portuguese in the speech of twenty Brazilian Portuguese and English bilingual adults, residents of the Chicago Metropolitan area, and it particularly focuses on (a) code switching and (b) lexical borrowing, two contact-induced phenomena common to situations of language maintenance.

It sought to investigate which sociolinguistic factors: (a) age of English onset and (b) length of English exposure, predictors of bilingual ability, were correlated with a preference for types of code-switching and for types of lexical borrowing.

Based on previous studies, two predictions for code-switching behavior were made. Regarding age of English onset, it was predicted that the earlier informants had been first exposed to English, the greater their preference for intrasentential code-switching, and the later informants had been first exposed to English, the greater their preference for extra-sentential code-switching. The same prediction was made for code-switching and length of exposure to English, i.e., the longer informants had been first exposed to English, the greater their preference for intrasentential code-switching, and the less exposure to English informants had experienced, the greater their preference for extra-sentential code-switching.

The lack of previous studies investigating the effects of the two sociolinguistic factors in focus on types of lexical borrowing did not allow any predictions to be made.
SUMMARY (continued)

Data was obtained in a total of 893 minutes of sociolinguistic interviews with participants and both qualitative and quantitative analyses were conducted. Results reveal that neither prediction regarding code-switching behavior was fulfilled. However, two correlations were found: one between age of English onset and a preference for intersentential code-switching, and the other between length of English exposure and a preference for extra-sentential code-switching. No correlations were found for types of lexical borrowing.
1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1. **Background**

Studies in the field of Contact Linguistics have shown that language contact situations throughout history have brought about a wide range of linguistic outcomes and various degrees of contact-induced phenomena. Winford (2003) - based on Wackernagel (1904) - identifies three broad kinds of contact situations: (a) language maintenance, (b) language shift, and (c) creation of new languages. Winford highlights that categorizing bilingual/multilingual communities into the three types of contact situations above is not always possible and also claims that uncovering factors and conditions that lead to each type of outcome and contact-induced phenomena is never a straightforward task. Weinreich (1953) argues that knowledge of the sociolinguistic aspects of a bilingual community and of the structure of both languages may enable linguists to predict its contact-induced outcomes; however, there has been later empirical evidence (e.g., Poplack, 1980; 1988) that each bilingual/multilingual community consists of a unique situation. That is, not only does each of those communities behave in a very particular way, but also the constellation of linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects that has a bearing on contact-induced changes can vary dramatically.

Given such variance and unpredictability, new studies on bilingual/multilingual speech communities can always contribute significantly to the field of Contact Linguistics as scholars may gain a deeper understanding of how languages are used in bilingual/multilingual contexts, an increasingly ubiquitous reality in our current globalized world.
Due to its immigration history, the United States has been home to a multiple number of ethnic communities in which one or more minority languages have co-existed with English, the majority language. At least 350 languages other than English are reported to be spoken in the country, among which Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, French, Vietnamese, Korean, German, Arabic, Russian, Italian and Portuguese - in this order - are the most widely spoken (American Community Survey, U.S. Census, 2015). Such linguistic diversity has given rise to a number of contact-induced situations and phenomena, some of which are systematically observed in language-contact studies - e.g., Spanish-English code-switching in New York City (Poplack, 1980); borrowing in Los Angeles Spanish (Silva-Corvalán, 1994); borrowing in Pennsylvania German (e.g., Fuller, 2001); Arabic-English code-switching in Western Pennsylvania and Northwest Virginia (Al-Enazi, 2002).

The City of Chicago is no exception to such linguistic diversity, which can be clearly observed in the wide range of ethnic neighborhoods and their corresponding immigrant enclaves. However, not all ethnic groups are concentrated in well-defined areas - which is the case of the Brazilians. This ethnic group is scattered throughout the Chicago metropolitan area and thus it seems to rely on very particular social network structures and on the existence of several types of institutions (e.g., religious, governmental, cultural and not-for-profit) in order to maintain its language and culture. This unique characteristic sets the Brazilian community apart from other ethnic groups in Chicagoland and from other Brazilian communities in the U.S. – such as the ones in the states of Massachusetts and New Jersey, where the largest concentrations of Portuguese speakers are found (U.S. Census, 2010). Studying such unique language contact situation can contribute to the field of Contact Linguistics. Additionally, it can help shed light on the linguistic behavior of speakers of what Lokensgard (2007) describes as one of the foreign languages spoken
in the U.S. in the most obscure situation. He attributes this obscurity to the fact that Spanish is the foreign language to receive the greatest attention in the country. Other contributing factors are: (a) the confusion in the linguistic classification of Portuguese (i.e., Portuguese is oftentimes mistaken as a Spanish dialect) and (b) the fragmentation of the group of Portuguese speakers in demographic reports by U.S. governmental agencies (i.e., Portuguese speakers not always identify as “Hispanics” and thus choose other ethnic/racial categories).

1.2. **Statement of the Problem**

Portuguese is among the eleven foreign languages most widely spoken in the US and the number of Brazilian immigrants increased considerably from 1980 to 2014 (Zong and Batalova, 2016). Nevertheless, very few research studies on language contact phenomena in the United States have focused on Brazilian Portuguese (BP) and none, to the best of the author’s knowledge, has investigated the linguistic behavior of BP/English bilinguals in the Chicago Metropolitan area. As a Brazilian born and raised in that country and a Portuguese and English bilingual resident of Chicago since 2009, the author has observed two main contact-induced phenomena, (a) lexical borrowing (LB), and (b) code-switching (CS), in the Portuguese repertoire of BP/English bilinguals residing in the Chicagoland area. According to Carvalho (2010), instances of both phenomena are plentiful in the Portuguese spoken in the U.S; however, very few studies have illustrated or systematically analyzed them (Bensabat-Ott, 2001; Meihy, 2004; Azevedo, 2005; Mota, 2008). Therefore, additional studies on the linguistic behavior of Portuguese speakers would be highly justifiable, as they would contribute to understanding the sociolinguistic landscape of the Portuguese language in the U.S.
There seems to be an agreement in the field that no language contact situation can be fully understood if extra-linguistic factors are not taken into account (Weinreich, 1953). Thomason and Kaufman (1988) observe that the literature has found enough evidence that “it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact” (p.35). Previous studies on bilingual/multilingual communities have examined the role of a wide range of extra-linguistic factors correlated with changes on the use of a minority language due to its contact with a majority one. Some of those include age, sex, social class, occupation, ethnic identity, mixing attitude and bilingual ability. Regarding this last one, age of arrival in the host country and/or age of second language (L2) onset as well as length of exposure and/or length of residence in the host country may be significant factors in predicting one’s bilingual ability. In other words, assuming that the “critical period hypothesis” (Penfield and Roberts, 1959) is correct, the earlier speakers have started learning a second language, the higher their L2 proficiency and thus bilingual ability. Also, assuming that length of exposure to an L2 is a predictor of bilingual ability, the longer speakers have been exposed to a second language, the higher their L2 proficiency and thus bilingual ability.

In a study of Puerto-Rican Spanish/English bilinguals in New York City, Poplack (1980) found a correlation between levels of bilingual proficiency and types of code-switching, in which highly-proficient bilinguals tended to code-switch intrasententially (within a sentence) and low-proficient bilinguals preferred to code-switch extra-sententially (on the border of sentences - e.g., fillers, fixed expressions, tags). Unlike the Brazilians in Chicagoland, the speech community under investigation in Poplack’s study consists of a stable bilingual community, in which members live in a well-defined area and interact with one another on a daily basis.
As previously mentioned, linguistic patterns as well as their correlating factors may vary within and across bilingual communities. Nevertheless, it would be worth investigating which factors - age of L2 onset and length of L2 exposure -, predictors of bilingual ability, might be correlated with a preference for one type of code-switching over another in the unique bilingual situation of the BP/English community in Chicagoland.

Although no previous studies, to the best of the author’s knowledge, have investigated a possible correlation between bilingual ability and types of lexical borrowing, the present study will extend the assumptions made for code-switching to instances of lexical borrowing. The aim is to investigate which factors - age of L2 onset and length of L2 exposure - may be correlated with lexical borrowing types.

1.3. **Present Study**

The present study explores the linguistic behavior of a group of twenty Brazilian Portuguese and English bilingual adults, residents of the Chicago Metropolitan area, and focuses on (a) code switching (CS) and (b) lexical borrowing (LB), two linguistic phenomena associated with situations of language maintenance. It particularly seeks to examine two socio-linguistic factors, (a) age one started learning English, and (b) length of exposure to English, in order to investigate which factor might correlate with a preference for one type of code-switching over another, in the Portuguese repertoire of this group of informants. It also seeks to investigate which of the factors aforementioned may correlate with a preference for one type of lexical borrowing over another. The goal is to access a window into the linguistic behavior of this ethnic speech community and the outcomes of its contact with English. Both quantitative and qualitative analyses
have been performed on the data in an attempt to identify unique patterns of bilingual behavior in this ethnic community and their corresponding sociolinguistic factors.

In this study, the word ‘bilingual’ refers to adults who can communicate in both Brazilian Portuguese and English in this language contact situation regardless of their proficiency level in the minority and/or majority language.
2. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

2.1. Code-Switching

Code-switching, broadly defined, refers to “several types of bilingual language mixture”, which include the alternation of codes between utterances, the alternation of codes between sentences/clauses, and “the insertion of (usually lexical) elements from one language into the other” (Winford, 2003, p.101). Although this definition may seem to convey a straightforward concept, the various approaches under which code-switching has been investigated in a variety of fields (e.g., anthropology, linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociology) has led to a wide range of definitions and terminologies, causing a great amount of debate and confusion.

Haugen (1956) was the first scholar to use the term to describe a situation in which “a bilingual introduces a completely unassimilated word from another language into his speech” (p. 40). Di Pietro (1977) limits the alternation of codes to the boundaries of the speech act in order for it to be considered code-switching. Grosjean (1982) defines it more broadly as “the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation” (p.145), whereas Auer (1995) excludes situations in which the alternations occurs in “non-contiguous stretches of talk” (p.116). The alternation of varieties of the same language is also included as code-switching by some; yet, this type of bidialectal language mixture is beyond the scope of this study and thus will not be discussed. For Winford (2003), “juxtaposition of elements from the two codes is a prerequisite for code-switching” (p. 103). Winford’s view seems to be in agreement with Gumperz’s (1982.), who defines it as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (p.59).
The term code-switching has been claimed to convey ambiguity (e.g., Romaine, 1989; Gardner-Chloros, 1995; Backus, 1996, as cited in Bensabat-Ott, 2001) as if bilinguals would speak each language separately after each switch. Bensabat-Ott points out that, while it may happen occasionally, the term is misleading because “it describes the bilingual as a sum of two monolinguals, and not the complex and psychological entity that he/she is” (p. 20).

For this study, I will adopt Grosjean’s (1982) broad definition of code-switching presented above and also linguistic terms such as intersentential, intrasentential and extra-sentential to describe types of code-switching. Intersentential code-switching, as illustrated in examples (1) and (2), refers to the alternation of codes between sentences and/or clauses, whereas intrasentential code-switching refers to the alternation of codes within the same sentence, as seen in example (3) and (4). The odd number examples below were taken from Poplack (1980; p. 594, p.597), whereas the even numbers were found in the corpus of the present study.

Example 1:

“Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español.”

((tr.: Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English and finish in Spanish))

Example 2:

“Eu sempre pergunto isso quando eu tenho que tirar a neve do carro e scrape it up and,.”

((tr.: I always ask that when I have to remove the snow off the car and scrap it up and,))

Example 3:

“But I used to eat the bofe, the brain. And then they stopped selling it
because *tenian, este, le encontraron que tenía* worms.”
((tr.: they had, uh, they found out that it had worms))

Example 4:

a) “Eu sou casada com uma pessoa que não fala português. Então, isso é um *challenge* a mais.”
   ((tr.: I am married to someone who does not speak Portuguese. So, this is an extra challenge))

b) “Americanos *get it done.*”
   ((tr.: Americans get it done))

Each sentence in example (4) contains a different subtype of intrasentential code-switch, which is worth differentiating. In sentence (a), there is a single-noun switch (SNS), whereas in sentence (b) the switched part consists of a verb phrase. Single nouns have been reported to be the most frequently switched item (e.g., Timm 1975; Wentz, 1977, as cited in Poplack, 1980) and the easiest grammatical category to plug into a sentence. Sentence (b), on the other hand, illustrates a more complex bilingual switching maneuver since it requires knowledge of complex syntactic rules and a higher level of proficiency in both languages. For this study, I will use a model in which intrasentential code-switching is divided into two subtypes: (a) single noun switches (SNSs) and (b) other (OT), i.e., grammatical categories that are more complex than SNSs (e.g., noun phrases, verbs, verb phrases). Identifying each grammatical category other than single nouns is beyond the scope of the present study. Therefore, they will be considered as only one group.

Similar to what Poplack (1980) described as “tag-switching” (p.613), extra-sentential switches occur on the borderline of sentences, and refer to tags, fillers, interjections and fixed expressions, which are more syntactically independent and can be easily inserted into utterances
without the risk of violating grammatical rules - and thus do not seem to require a higher level of proficiency in the language of the switch. This type of code-switching is illustrated in example (5), taken from Poplack (1980, p. 600) and example (6), found in the corpus of this study.

Example 5:

Mi mai tuvo que ir a firmar y shit pa' sacarme, you know.

((tr.: My mom had to go sign 'n shit to get me out, you know.))

Example 6:

“O Carlos mexicano, que eu nunca mais vi. Faz mais de quarenta anos que eu não vejo ele. Sim, o Pedro, o Paulo, Na, não, you name it!”

((tr.: Carlos, the Mexican guy, who I have not seen lately. It’s been over forty years since I saw him. Yes, Pedro, Paulo. No, no, you name it!))

The linguistic model devised to analyze the present data is summarized in Table I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code-Switching Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersentential</strong></td>
<td>Alternation of codes between sentences and/or clauses</td>
<td>“Eu sempre pergunto isso quando eu tenho que tirar a neve do carro e scrape it up and,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrasentential</strong></td>
<td>(a) SNSs (b) Other</td>
<td>(a) “Isso é um challenge a mais.” (b) “Americanos get it done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) SNSs (b) Other</td>
<td>Alternation of codes within the same sentence (a) Single noun switches (b) All other grammatical Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra-sentential</strong></td>
<td>Switches on the borderline of sentences; Syntactically independent expressions</td>
<td>“Sim, o Pedro, o Paulo, Na, não, you name it!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
levels of bilingual proficiency. That is, informants with higher levels of bilingual proficiency were engaging in more intrasentential code-switching than their non-fluent bilingual counterparts (i.e., Spanish-dominant), who in turn would engage in more extra-sentential switches, which require a lower proficiency level in the CS language (i.e., English). As for community behavior, bilinguals in this study tended to transition from one code to another very smoothly, i.e., without making use of flagging markers (e.g., hesitation, repetition, translation, metalinguistic commentary), and made use of both languages as a way to exercise their dual identity. Poplack concludes that bilingual ability has an effect on types of code-switching produced by this community, and that norms of bilingual behavior, and not insufficient knowledge of either language, is constraining their code-switching behavior so much so that code-switching could be seen as a mode of communication as much as monolingual speech.

In another study of code-switching among French/English bilinguals, Poplack (1989) sought to analyze the effects of English on the French spoken in the Canadian communities of Hull and Ottawa, where French has the status of majority and minority language, respectively. For that, she analyzed 290 hours of audio-recorded French conversations of 120 informants, randomly selected from five neighborhoods, and found that both Hull and Ottawa speakers described their French as imperfect and too anglicized. However, only the Ottawa informants overtly admitted to engaging in code-switching and showed a neutral attitude towards it, claiming that using English conveys meaning more succinctly and expressively. Quantitative analysis also showed that Ottawa speakers were engaging in intrasentential code-switching more frequently than their Hull counterparts.

Unlike the Puerto-Rican Spanish/English community, both Hull and Ottawa bilingual speakers tended to switch to English in order to achieve certain discourse effects and did so with
full awareness by interrupting the flow of speech so as to draw the listener’s attention to the code alternation. Among the most common code-switching functions observed in speakers of both communities are *mot juste* (i.e., when a concept is better expressed by a certain word/expression in the language of the code-switch), metalinguistic commentary, English bracketing and repetition/translation/explanation of the English word/expression in French.

### 2.2. Lexical Borrowing

Lexical borrowing is “an extremely common form of cross-linguistic influence” (Winford, 2003, p.29). It consists of the borrowing of lexemes, sememes and other linguistic aspects from a source language (SL) or donor language (DL) into a recipient language (RL). The literature (e.g., Haugen, 1969) has provided evidence that the minority languages of ethnic communities in industrialized countries are likely to borrow lexical items from the majority language to a much larger degree than the opposite (Winford, 2003). In either case, the RL speakers are the agents of change, a characteristic that sets lexical borrowing apart from other contact-induced phenomena (e.g., ‘substratum influence’ when SL speakers - usually bilinguals, but SL dominant – are the agents of change).

Among various frameworks (Paul, 1886; Seiler, 1907-13; Kaufman, 1939; Betz, 1949, as cited in Winford, 2003) developed for the study of the lexical contact phenomena, Haugen’s (1969) taxonomy has been regarded as comprehensive and thus widely accepted in the field. Therefore, it will be used as a framework for the analysis of the data of the present study. Haugen classifies lexical contact into two categories: (a) borrowings, and (b) creations. The first “involves imitation of some aspect of the donor language” (Winford, 2003, p.43) - English, in this case - and the second “involves entirely native creations with no counterparts in the donor language” (p. 43). Since the
author has not witnessed instances of (b) native creations in the BP repertoire of the BP/English bilinguals in Chicagoland, this study will solely focus on category (a) borrowings.

Borrowings are subdivided into (1) loanwords and (2) loanshifts. According to Winford (2003), the former consists of loans whose full or partial morphemic composition is borrowed from the SL, and the later refers to loans whose morphemic composition comes from the RL (but whose meaning derives completely or partially from the SL). Examples of (1) loanwords mentioned in the interviews include maniola for English ‘money order’, parquear for English ‘to park’ and bumpizinho for English ‘small bump’. The first loanword undergoes partial morphophonemic substitution, whereas the second is the product of a combination between DL stem (park) + RL affix (ar). ‘Park’ is morphemically substituted with parque and receives – ar, the Portuguese inflectional morpheme for the infinitive form of 1st conjugation verbs. Bumpizinho is the result of a similar process in which the RL derivational suffix –inho (meaning ‘small’) is added to the English stem ‘bump’ to describe ‘a small bump’. Some examples of (2) loanshifts are deixar alguém saber for English ‘to let someone know’, and aplicar for English ‘to apply (for a job/position)’. A phrase such as me deixa saber, meaning ‘let me know’, would be hardly understood by a monolingual Portuguese speaker since verbs like informar and avisar (e.g., me avisa) already serve this function in Brazilian Portuguese. In standard Brazilian Portuguese, the meaning of aplicar is equivalent to English “to make use of something or use it for a practical purpose” (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). In the data, the Portuguese word gains a new meaning modeled on the English meaning “to request something, usually officially, especially in writing or by sending in a form” (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.) as in example (7) below.
Example 7:

_Era a terceira vez que eu estava aplicando para a empresa,_

_ que nesse meio tempo eu fiquei aplicando muitas vezes para._ (. )

_aplicando, não, porque era um processo diferente antigamente e aí_

tipo coincidentemente os dias que tinham provas,

_ eram dias que eu não estava disponível._

((tr.: It was the third time I was applying to the company, 
in the meantime, I applied many times to (. )

not applying because it used to be a different process in the past and

coincidently, the days when the exams would take place

were the days when I was not available))

Loanwords can be (1.1) pure loanwords, which can vary from “total morphemic importation of single or compound words” and “degrees of phonemic substitution” to “possible semantic change” (Winford, 2003, p. 45) (e.g., _maniola_, shots – pronounced with Portuguese phonology [ʃɔtis]); and (1.2) loanblends, a combination of recipient language morphemes and donor language morphemes. Loanblends, in turn, can be (1.2.1) derivational (SL stem + RL affix or RL stem + SL affix - e.g., _parquear, bumpizinho_) or (1.2.2) compound (SL stem + RL stem or vice-versa – no instances found in the data). On the other hand, (2) loanshifts (or loan meanings) can be subdivided into (2.1) extensions (or semantic loans), and (2.2) loan translations (or calques). The former refers to the extension of the meaning(s) of an RL word modelled on an SL counterpart (e.g., _aplicar, aplicação_), and the latter consists of the exact replication of an SL pattern with RL words (e.g., _Me deixa saber_ for ‘let me know’). Other examples of (2.1) extensions are _escola_
‘school’ (not used to refer to university or college in monolingual BP) and condomínio, which in monolingual BP has other meanings, including ‘the common area (e.g., entrance) shared by residents of all units in a condominium’, and ‘the monthly fee paid by all units in a condominium in order to maintain such area’. Instances of escola, meaning ‘university/college’ (like ‘school’ in English) and condomínio referring to ‘a unit in a condominium building’ (like ‘condominium’ or ‘condo’ in English) were present in the data. As for (2.2) calques, fazer o ponto de ‘to make the point of’ and estar suposto a ‘to be supposed to’ are modeled on English phrases whose meaning is expressed by different phrases in monolingual BP, i.e., fazer questão de and ter que/dever que, respectively. The types and subtypes of LB are summarized in Table II.

The most frequently reported sociocultural motivations for lexical borrowing in the literature are “need” and “prestige”. In general terms, lexical gaps and/or a lack of finer nuances of meaning in the RL seem to account for the first reason, whereas the second refers to the social value associated with the SL by the RL speakers. However, in situations of close contact between two languages, as a result of immigration for instance, the interaction of micro- and macro-sociolinguistic factors may play a more significant role on the motivations for lexical borrowing. As Winford (2003) puts it, “notions like ‘need’ and ‘prestige’ must be understood in relation to the social aspects of the contact situation, particularly the kinds of culture contact and social interaction that characterize the relationship between the groups involved” (p.39).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LB Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Loanwords</td>
<td>Form derives from DL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Pure loanwords</td>
<td>Importation of DL morphemes; (may involve degrees of phonemic substitution and change in meaning)</td>
<td><em>Maniola</em> (money order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Loanblends</td>
<td>Combination of DL and SL morphemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Derivational blend</td>
<td>SL stem + RL affix; RL stem + SL affix</td>
<td><em>Bumpizinho</em> (bump + <em>inho</em> = small bump)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Quitei</em> (quit + <em>ei</em> = inflectional morpheme, 1st person singular, past, = I quit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Parquear</em> (park + <em>ar</em> = to park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Compound blend</td>
<td>SL stem + RL stem or vice-versa</td>
<td>Not found in data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loanshifts</td>
<td>Form derives from RL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Extensions (semantic loans)</td>
<td>Extension of meaning of RL word based on DL counterpart.</td>
<td><em>Aplicar</em> <em>(para um emprego)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Escola</em> (school, university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Condomínio</em> (condo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Calques (loan translations)</td>
<td>RL word(s) replicate a DL pattern</td>
<td><em>Deixar alguém saber</em> (let someone know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fazer o ponto de</em> (to make the point of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Estar suposto a</em> (to be supposed to)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a large-scale study of the English lexical influence on Canadian French, Poplack et al. (1988) sought to investigate a number of sociolinguistic factors (i.e., age, sex, language proficiency, social class and neighborhood) constraining the English borrowing rates and types (i.e., ‘nonce’, occurring once; and ‘widespread’, used by many speakers) in the French spoken by 120 monolinguals and French/English bilinguals, residents of five different neighborhoods in the areas of Ottawa and Hull. Analysis of the twenty-thousand loan tokens points to a correlation between the frequency of English loanwords on the one hand and social class and neighborhood on the other. That is, members of the upper class were borrowing significantly less from English than members of other social classes, whereas Ottawa speakers were using English loanwords more frequently than their Hull counterparts. As for borrowing types, bilinguals, especially those living in English-dominant neighborhoods in Ottawa, were using the highest rates of ‘nonce’ borrowings, pointing to the conclusion that the rates of ‘nonce’ borrowings in the communities under investigation were not contingent upon need, but on internal norms of bilingual behavior.

Similarly, in a study of French loanwords and code-switches in the Dutch spoken by the residents of the Belgian municipalities of Anderlecht and Brussels, Treffers-Daller (1994) sought to investigate differences in code-switching and borrowing rates between both groups of speakers and the extra-linguistic factors influencing such differences. Results showed a correlation between rates of borrowing and code-switching on the one hand, and social ties with French speakers on the other. Brussels residents, who had more opportunities to interact with French speakers through social networks, produced higher rates of French loanwords and code-switches than their Anderlecht counterparts, who, in turn, were more exposed to Dutch than French and fulfilled their borrowing needs from Standard Belgian Dutch. Treffers-Daller concluded that the linguistic behavior of the communities under investigation was contingent upon their internal norms.
In a study of the effects of English on the Spanish spoken by bilinguals at different levels of Spanish proficiency in Los Angeles, Silva-Corvalán (1994) used the “critical period hypothesis” (Lenneberg, 1967, as cited in Silva-Corvalán, 1994) and the number of years of exposure to English as bases for separating her 50 informants into three intergenerational groups - Group 1 (G1) consisting of Mexican-born speakers who moved to the U.S. after 11 years of age and lived in the host country for at least 5 years (usually referred to as generation 1), Group 2 (GP2) including US-born and Mexican-born speakers who immigrated to the US before 6 years old (generation 2 and generation 1.5, respectively), and Group 3 (GP3) consisting of US-born speakers whose father and/or mother met one of the criteria of G2. Silva-Corvalán sought to explore lexical, syntactic and semantic changes in Spanish as a result of its contact with English in a Mexican-American neighborhood in eastern Los Angeles. Evidence of changes at the lexical level were more robust in GP 2 and GP 3, with speakers transferring form-meaning items from DL (English) to RL (Spanish) - a phenomenon referred to as loanwords in this study - and/or modelling RL items on those of the DL - a phenomenon referred to here as loanshifts. Silva-Corvalán concludes that these “acts of shifting” by GP 2 and GP3 speakers was in conflict with their “acts of loyalty” (p.168), i.e., their reported positive attitudes towards Spanish and desire to pass on the language to the generations to come. In other words, by filling their Spanish repertoire with lexical transfers and models from English, GP 2 and GP3 speakers were not taking action to maintain their Spanish and hand it down to younger generations. That said, it was the same ‘acts of shifting” that were enabling second and third generation speakers to maintain their Spanish.

Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) findings are similar to those of Otheguy et al. (1989). In their study of Cuban-Americans in New York, Otheguy and associates found that first-generation speakers were using more loanwords than loanshifts (the latter representing only 0.1% of their corpus).
Second-generation speakers, in turn, were using more loanshifts than loanwords, and also slightly more loanwords than their first-generation counterparts. They conclude that the frequent use of single-word calques that displaced their Spanish equivalents was a sign that second-generation speakers were experiencing a decrease in their knowledge of the Spanish lexicon.

With different research goals and their corresponding designs, all the studies aforementioned attempted to account for instances of lexical borrowing in an RL through sociolinguistic lenses. While Poplack et al. (1988) and Treffers-Daller (1994) chose speech communities on the basis of region for comparison. Otheguy et al. (1989) and Silva-Corvalán (1994) compared the bilingual behavior of different generations in the same community in a ‘language shift’ context.

2.3. Previous Studies on Brazilian Portuguese in the United States

Very few research studies on language contact phenomena in the United States have focused on Brazilian Portuguese and none, to the best of the author’s knowledge, has investigated the linguistic behavior of BP/English bilinguals in the Chicago Metropolitan area.

Bensabat-Ott (2001) was a pioneer in the systematic investigation of sociolinguistic and grammatical constraints on code-switching among Brazilian Portuguese and English bilinguals in the United States. In her ethnographic study of BP/English bilinguals in the greater Washington D.C. area, she found out that her group of eight 15-55 year-old informants preferred Portuguese for intra-group communication and attributed speaking this minority language to a strong Brazilian identity. Portuguese was also the base language for code-switching – which was regarded as a positive linguistic behavior by the majority - and intrasentential, followed by intersentential and extra-sentential in this order, was the most common CS type.
Among sociolinguistic constraints, gender, length of U.S. residence, age, level of education and CS attitude were found to be correlated with CS rates. Gender was the extra-linguistic factor with a lesser effect on CS rates with women using all code-switching types slightly more than men. Years of residence in the U.S. as well as age have showed similar effects with those who lived up to 10 years code-switching more often than those with 11 years and over of U.S. residence. Also, the first group (up to 10 residence years) used more intersentential than intra- and extra-sentential CS switching. Younger informants (15 – 29 years of age) engaged in CS at substantially higher rates than their older (30 years old and over) counterparts. Finally, level of education and CS attitude were the external constraints with the most significant effect on the number of code-switches. High-school degree holding informants code-switched at much higher rates than those who held a college or technical degree (68% and 32% of the total number of CSs, respectively), whereas the one (and only) subject with a negative attitude towards CS engaged in this behavior no more than a couple of times. Bensabatt-Ott also assessed the validity of ten grammatical constraints (e.g., Poplack’s Free Morpheme and Equivalence constraints, Clyne’s Triggering Hypothesis, Gumperz’ Constraint) on her BP/English corpus and found that none were valid.

The phenomenon of lexical borrowing in the minority language of Brazilian Portuguese in the U.S. has been reported so far, to the best of the author’s knowledge, by few scholars (Meihy, 2004; Azevedo, 2005; and Mota, 2008).

In his account of the experiences of 100 Brazilians residing in New York City, obtained via over 700 interviews, Meihy (2004) seeks to report and discuss the reality of this ethnic group and their search for a Brazilian identity in their new host country. While a systematic linguistic analysis is not the aim of this study, Meihy (2004) briefly reports a list of the most widely used instances of English borrowings, which, according to Haugen’s taxonomy (1969) could be divided...
into loanwords and loanshifts. *Parquear* for ‘to park’, *estopar* for ‘to stop’, and *retirado* for ‘retired’ - which in monolingual BP are expressed by *estacionar*, *parar* and *aposentado*, respectively - are examples of loanwords, more specifically loanblends, which seem to be displacing their RL monolingual counterparts. Among loanshifts, the scholar mentions *teatro* for ‘movie theater’, *esperto* for ‘expert’, *pretender* for ‘to pretend’ and *suportar* for ‘to support’- i.e., *cinema*, *especialista*, *fingir* and *apoiar*, respectively, in monolingual BP (p.228). The examples of loanshifts can be sub-classified as semantic extensions since those words already exist in monolingual BP, but with different meanings – *teatro* ‘theater’, *esperto* ‘clever’, *pretender* ‘to intend’ and *suportar* ‘to bear/to tolerate’.


In a qualitative study of Brazilian families residing in Somerville, Massachusetts, Mota (2008) sought to identify communicative patterns in the speech of twenty-four second generation (G2) BP/English bilinguals. Using Gumperz’ (1992) ethnography of communication framework, she observed that language choice was correlated with interactional domain (English was the predominant language, except for church and home interactions), conversation topic (Portuguese was more adequate for Brazil-related topics) and interlocutor (“older and more respected” interlocutors were addressed in their language) (p.322). Also, the bilingual second generation children would engage in three types of linguistic behavior: (a) monolingual speech, (b) “bilingual
speech as intergenerational boundary” (p.324), (c) “code-switching and code-mixing in bilingual speech” (p.326, 327).

The G2 children would engage in (a) monolingual speech only when addressing English monolinguals; on the other hand, when speaking to Portuguese monolinguals, they would very frequently switch to English to the detriment of achieving solidarity. When communicating with BP/English bilinguals, English was the preferred language. An (b) intergenerational gap pattern was observed between BP-speaking parents and their bilingual children in which “older children and girls tend to address their parents more often in Portuguese than younger children and boys” (p.325). Also, younger children would use their older siblings as interpreters to communicate with parents and English was the exclusive language in interaction among siblings.

Spontaneous instances of (c) code-switching and code-mixing (the latter referred to as lexical borrowing in the present study) were plentiful in Mota’s (2008) corpus. The first was reported to facilitate and speed up the communication process between BP/English bilinguals who share the same two linguistic systems. Yet, this positive attitude is mixed with a sense of ‘weirdness’ and even inferiority for not being able to keep the two languages separated. Regarding borrowings, instances of English-modeled words inserted into Portuguese were reported to outnumber instances of Portuguese-modeled words into the English speech repertoire of the G2 informants. Some examples from Mota’s (2008) data include *parquear* (to park, for monolingual Portuguese *estacionar*), *vaquear* (to vaccum, for monolingual Portuguese *aspirar*), *cambecar* (to come back, for monolingual Portuguese *voltar, retornar*) (p.328).

Some of the studies aforementioned have acknowledged a dearth of systematic studies on the bilingual behavior of BP/English speakers in the United States and have also stressed the need for newer studies that tap into this understudied ethnic community in the US. While conducting a
systematic analysis of her metropolitan Washington, D.C. corpus and uncovering significant information about patterns of code-switching behavior and correlating sociolinguistic aspects, Besabat-Ott (2001) worked with a small sample (n=8), which might raise issues of representativeness of the speech community in focus. Meihy’s (2004) and Mota’s (2008) larger numbers of informants (n=100 and n=24, respectively), on the other hand, lend more representativeness to their corpora; however, despite reporting instances of lexical borrowing and/or code-switching, the aim of neither study was to conduct a sociolinguistic qualitative and quantitative analysis of these two contact-induced phenomena found in the speech of their BP/English bilingual informants. Instead, both studies aimed to investigate the Brazilian communities in focus through socio-historical and socio-pragmatic lenses, respectively, while taking a qualitative approach.

The need for further systematic studies on the bilingual behavior of BP/English speakers, along with the unique characteristic of the Brazilian community in the Chicago metropolitan area (i.e., not concentrating in a well-defined ethnic area), and the fact that each bilingual community is unique and patterns of linguistic behavior may vary in and across speech communities seem to make a compelling case for the present study to be conducted.
3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

3.1. Study Aims

The present study aims to:

1. Provide a descriptive account of lexical borrowing and code-switching present in the Portuguese spoken by a group of 20 Brazilian Portuguese/English bilingual residents of Chicagoland, informants of this study.

2. Analyze the effects of age of English onset and length of exposure to English on the types of lexical borrowing and code-switching among the members of the aforementioned group.

Results obtained will help:

1. Understand the linguistic behavior of the group of 20 Brazilian Portuguese/English bilinguals, residents of Chicagoland, informants of this study.

2. Identify if the sociolinguistic factors in focus have influenced the linguistic behavior of the group in question in this language-contact situation.

3. Expand knowledge of the linguistic behavior of Brazilian Portuguese and English bilingual communities residing in the U.S.

4. Expand knowledge of both types of language contact phenomena, providing further insight into the field of Contact Linguistics.
3.2. **Code-Switching**

3.2.1. **Research Question 1**

Which factors - age of English onset or length of English exposure - might be correlated with a preference for one type of code-switching over another in the Portuguese repertoire of the BP/English bilinguals in this study?

3.2.2. **Hypothesis 1**

Premise (1): Age of L2 onset is associated with the Critical Period Hypothesis, which proposes that the earlier speakers are first exposed to L2, the higher L2 proficiency they will obtain.

Premise (2): In Poplack (1980), the higher the bilingual proficiency of the informants, the preference for intrasentential code-switching, and the lower the proficiency of the informants, the preference for extra-sentential code-switching.

Based on premises (1) and (2) above, I propose the following prediction:

Among the 20 BP/English bilinguals in this study, those with earlier exposure to English may show a greater statistical preference for intrasentential code-switching - especially that of OT type, which requires a higher level of proficiency than simply plugging SNSs into a sentence -, whereas informants with first exposure to English later in life may show a higher preference for extra-sentential code-switching.
3.2.3. **Hypothesis 2**

Premise (3): Length of L2 exposure is a predictor of bilingual ability, meaning that the longer speakers are exposed to L2, the higher L2 proficiency they will obtain.

Premise (4): In Poplack (1980), the higher the bilingual proficiency of the informants, the preference for intrasentential code-switching, and the lower the proficiency of the informants, the preference for extra-sentential code-switching.

Based on premises (3) and (4) above, I propose the following prediction:

Among the 20 BP/English bilinguals in this study, those with longer exposure to English may show a greater statistical preference for intrasentential code-switching - especially that of OT type, which requires a higher level of proficiency than simply plugging SNSs into a sentence -, whereas informants with less exposure to English may show a higher preference for extra-sentential code-switching.

3.3. **Lexical Borrowing**

Since no studies have attempted to investigate a possible correlation between age of L2 onset and/or length of exposure on the one hand, and types of lexical borrowing on the other, there are no premises from which to draw a prediction for lexical borrowing behavior. Therefore, the same research question for code-switching will be proposed for lexical borrowing, but no predictions will be made.
3.3.1. **Research Question 2**

Which factors - age of English onset or length of English exposure - might be correlated with a preference for one type of lexical borrowing over another in the Portuguese repertoire of the BP/English bilinguals in this study?
4. METHODS

4.1. Participants

4.1.1. Age and Gender

The participants of this study are twenty (n=20) Brazilian Portuguese/English bilingual adults, residents of the Chicago metropolitan area, fifteen of which are female and five are male. Most of the participants have Portuguese as a first language (L1), except for one male informant, who migrated from a romance-language speaking country to Brazil at the age of ten and acquired native-like proficiency in Portuguese. Despite having learned Portuguese before English from family members, two of the female informants were exposed to both Portuguese and English at a very early age. One was consistently exposed to both languages from five years of age on and the other was born in the US and exposed to both languages for part of her childhood and intermittent parts of her adolescence and adulthood.

Participants’ ages during data collection ranged from 28 to 77 years old with a group mean of \( \approx 49 \) years of age. Over half of the group (n=11) was between the ages of 30 and 49 years old, 10 of which were women. They are followed by the group between 70 and 79 years old (n=4, evenly distributed by gender) and those between 50 and 70 years old (n=4, also evenly distributed by gender). Only 1 participant, a female, was under 29 years of age.

4.1.2. Occupation and Educational Attainment

The distribution of occupations was based on the Major Occupation Groupings (MOGs) criteria by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor (2001). Two
of the informants were already retired when the data was collected. Since there is no such MOG category, they were placed according to their main occupation during their working years.

Participants’ occupations seem to fit into three main groups: Professional and Technical (MOG A, n=10), Administrative Support (MOG D, n=8), and Transportation and Material Moving (MOG G, n=2), with half of the informants holding positions that require professional and/or technical training (MOG A). According to Margolis (2009), most Brazilian immigrants in the U.S. are in MOG K (Service); yet, others may be in MOGs A, C (Sales) and E (Repair and Construction) (Siqueira and Jansen, 2008). The lack of informants with positions in construction, sales and service shows that the occupational distribution of this group of informants does not reflect the occupational pattern of Brazilian immigrants in the U.S. Yet, oral accounts by several members of the Brazilian community in Chicagoland have revealed that a large number of the local Brazilian population has migrated to the area for different reasons than those of most members of other Brazilian communities in the U.S. (e.g., Massachusetts, New York). While the average Brazilian in other areas has moved to the U.S. in search of better socio-economic opportunities, a large number of Brazilians in Chicagoland have been reported to be transferred to the region in order to occupy professional, technical, executive and managerial positions in the local offices of their work organizations, many of which bringing along their Brazilian spouses and children. This is the case of 4 informants in this study. Others are reported to have migrated to Chicagoland in order to pursue studies (which is the case of 4 informants) and also in order to join their American spouses (8 informants of this study). If such claims are true, this group would seem to reflect the local Brazilian occupational pattern to some extent. Among the 20 informants, only 3 have moved to the U.S. in search of better socio-economic opportunities, while 1 came to work in the arts.
As for educational attainment, half of the informants (n=10) has obtained a college degree, whereas the other half either has some or complete High School (n=5), or has earned a graduate college degree (n=5).

4.1.3. Age of English Onset

Unlike Poplack (1980), age of L2 onset in this study does not coincide with age of arrival in the host country. The reason being, a number of informants (n=12) had been exposed to English in Brazil before immigrating to the United States. In Brazil, many families send their children to private English language schools where they take integrated-skill classes (ranging from 3 hours to 7.5 hours a week) to develop English communication skills. Some children start such classes as early as 5 years of age, while others may start as adolescents or adults. Therefore, it is noteworthy that age of L2 onset in this study refers to the age at which one started learning English for communication purposes, either in an EFL or ESL context, or informally in an English-speaking environment.

Almost half of the group (n=9) started learning English by 13 years of age, with the majority (n=7) attending EFL classes in Brazil and starting their English studies between 9 and 13 years of age. Among the remaining two informants, one (n=1) attended American schools outside the U.S., starting at 5 years of age, whereas the other (n=1) was born in the United States and migrated back to Brazil with parents at around the same age.

The other half (n=11) started learning English at 14 years old and over, with one informant starting EFL classes at the age of 14 and four as adults by 23 years old. Among the remaining six, two started learning English in ESL classes at 19 and 23 years of age, and four learned English for communication informally after moving to the U.S. between the ages of 23 and 44.
4.1.4. **Length of Exposure to English**

Length of exposure to English in this study refers to the approximate number of years informants have been living in the United States and/or lived in other English-speaking countries, plus the approximate number of years informants studied English in Brazil and/or in American schools outside the U.S.

Length of exposure to English range from 8 to over 50 years, with a minority (n=2) being exposed for less than 10 years, a majority (n=12) to 20 years and over, and a small group (n=6) being exposed for 11-19 years.

4.2. **Data Collection**

The data for the present study was obtained through audio-recorded sociolinguistic interviews with volunteers recruited by the author on visits to several religious, governmental and cultural institutions in the metropolitan area of Chicago where Brazilians meet and congregate on a regular basis (see Appendix A for initial recruitment script, and Appendix B for re-contact script). Three eligibility criteria for participation were observed: (a) ability to speak both Brazilian Portuguese and English (regardless of the proficiency in either language), (b) current residence in Chicagoland, and (c) minimum age of 18 years old (see Appendix C for eligibility screening). The interviews took place over the course of 2-3 months in the fall of 2016.

The sampling technique was snowball sampling, a recruitment method widely used in Sociology, which consists of existing participants using their social networks in order to recruit further ones (see Appendix D for snowball recruitment script). The choice of this sampling method may be regarded as one of the limitations of this study as it may raise issues of representativeness. However, the inexistence of a Brazilian neighborhood and/or block in Chicagoland makes the
choice of more statistically significant sampling methods unfeasible. Therefore, snowball sampling seems to be a more reliable recruitment option for this type of speech community and also one technique that approximates the unique way in which Brazilians in Chicagoland establish and develop social ties within their local ethnic community.

The sociolinguistic interviews were conducted immediately after recruitment or scheduled for another day, at the volunteer’s discretion. Volunteers also had the option to be interviewed individually by the author, or with one or two other volunteers of their choice in a location familiar to them and where they felt safe and comfortable. A total of 19 sociolinguistic interviews were conducted, 18 of which individually and one with two informants. Most of them (n=15) took place in the volunteers’ workplace, three at their homes and one at the informant’s church.

Since the main goal of this study was to investigate the effects of English on the subordinate language of Brazilian Portuguese, Portuguese was the primary language of the interviews. Yet, informants were told to feel free to use whatever language they felt most comfortable with at any point of the interview.

4.2.1. **The Sociolinguistic Interview**

The sociolinguistic interview consisted of three parts: (1) written and oral consent (see Appendix E and F for consent forms), (2) demographic questions and elicitation of narratives, and (3) language-related questions.

According to Labov (1984), narrative is the most effective conversational genre for gathering sociolinguistic data because, when engaged in narrative telling, informants pay minimal attention to speech, which leads to the production of vernacular language, that is, language produced and encountered in ordinary life situations. With this in mind, the interviewer (the
author) aimed to keep the discourse as conversational as possible by asking open-ended questions about everyday life topics that could lead to the production of narratives. Such set of questions were based on Labov’s (1984) “modules” (see Appendix G for the complete set of questions for this study) and used as points of departure for yielding personal narratives. Moreover, the principal of tangential shifting was respected, allowing informants to drop any topic proposed and, instead, to speak about any topic of their preference.

Demographic questions were of equal importance for this study as they sought to obtain sociocultural information about the participants that would be used to construct a demographic profile and to be tested against the data. In order to keep a conversational style, demographic questions were mixed and mingled with the open-ended ones during the first part of the interview. This strategy proved to be very successful with this group of informants, who would reveal demographic details and engage in a good deal of narrative telling while walking the interviewer through their personal stories.

Language-related questions were asked towards the final part of the interview only after opportunities for narratives had been exhausted. This strategy was used so that language awareness would not hinder the elicitation of vernacular speech.

Each interview ranged from 28 minutes to 82 minutes, totaling 893 minutes and a mean of \( \cong 45 \) minutes.

4.3. Procedure

4.3.1. Transcribing the Data

After each interview was conducted, the author listened to it within one or two weeks in order to keep impressions fresh and be able to take as many notes as possible about the informant’s
behavior during the interview. Notes about the informant’s demographics and mentioned/observed sociolinguist factors were made and an individual profile was created for each participant. Then, the author transcribed the parts of the interview where instances of code-switching and borrowing had taken place, using Jefferson’s transcription conventions (2004).

4.3.2. Code-Switching Versus Lexical Borrowing

The morphophonemic criterion was used as the basis to distinguish code-switches from lexical borrowings, especially at the single word level. That is, single-words that were not integrated into RL – regardless of being pronounced with a ‘Brazilian Portuguese’ accent - were classified as code-switches (e.g., environment, challenging, gum, overtime), whereas those that were partially or fully integrated into RL were considered loanwords (e.g., bumpizinho, aplicar, quitar [kwitar] for ‘to quit’). Instances of established loanwords that have been long part of BP monolinguals’ lexicon - and thus added to BP monolingual dictionaries - such as ‘show’, meaning ‘concert’, ‘shopping center’ and ‘brunch’ were omitted from the analysis. Like in Poplack (1980), food names, proper names and place names (e.g., tofurkey, Mary, Truman College, Barrington) were excluded. Ethnically-loaded (i.e., untranslatable) items, which have no RL counterparts (e.g., townhomes, playdate, green card, au pair, Memorial Day, commute, middle school) or whose RL counterparts do not fully convey the DL meaning (e.g., Dia das Bruxas, ‘Witches’ Day’ for Halloween; beco for alley) were equally disregarded. The reason being, their status as code-switches is ambiguous (Poplack, 1993). It might be argued that ethnically loaded items fill lexical gaps and thus should be regarded as borrowings. Yet, in order to keep consistency with the morphophonemic criterion and avoid classification issues, such items were excluded from the analysis.
Finally, only instances of code–switching and lexical borrowing that occurred in spontaneous speech, i.e., in narratives, when the vernacular variety is more likely to be used (Labov, 1984), were considered for this study. Instances of LB not produced by the informants of this study, but reported to have been heard by them from other BP/English bilinguals in Chicagoland (e.g., maniola for ‘money order’) were excluded from the quantitative analysis.

4.3.3. Organizing the Data

As observed in Table III, the duration of the interview was not the same for each participant (e.g., Daniela: 55 minutes; Teresa: 33 minutes; Carlos: 28 minutes) and thus the individual CS rates (e.g., Daniela: 32 CSs per 55 minutes; Teresa: 5 CSs per 33 minutes; Carlos: 1 CS per 28 minutes), as well as the individual LB rates, were not comparable among participants. In order to put the numerators (informants’ CS rates - as well as their LB rates) under the same denominator (interview minutes) and make numbers comparable, the author - following a similar strategy in Macaulay (2005) - sought to find a proportion. That is, if the interview had lasted 100 minutes for all of the informants and if CS had been used at a constant rate, how many CS instances would they have produced? That was operationalized with cross-multiplication

\[
\frac{a}{b} = \frac{x}{100}
\]

in which \(a\) is the actual number of CSs, \(b\) is the actual interview minutes, and \(x\) is the number of CSs if the interview had lasted 100 minutes (see examples 8-10 below).
Example 8:

Daniela

\[
\frac{32}{55} = \frac{x}{100} \quad x = 58.18 \quad x = 58
\]

Example 9:

Teresa

\[
\frac{5}{33} = \frac{x}{100} \quad x = 15.15 \quad x = 15
\]

Example 10:

Carlos

\[
\frac{1}{28} = \frac{x}{100} \quad x = 3.57 \quad x = 4
\]

Daniela code-switched 32 times in 55 minutes of interview. In the same proportion, if she had been interviewed for 100 minutes and the rate of CS had been a constant, she would have code-switched 58.18 times. Teresa code-switched 5 times in 33 minutes of interview. If her interview had lasted 100 minutes, she would have code-switched 15.15 times. Similarly, if instead of 28 minutes, Carlos’ interview had taken 100 minutes, he would have code-switched 3.57 times rather than 1 time. In order to make the new CS numbers more manageable for further classification per CS type, they were rounded in the following fashion. Those with decimals of 0.5 or higher were rounded up (e.g., 3.57 rounded up to 4), whereas those with decimals lower than 0.5 were rounded down (e.g., 58.18 and 15.15 were rounded down to 8 and 15, respectively).
Now that the individual rates are under the same denominator (i.e., 100 interview minutes), the informants can be arranged from highest to lowest CS rates (Table IV).

The same cross-multiplication procedure was followed to find individual LB rates under the same denominator (i.e., 100 interview minutes). Numbers are in Table V.

The next step was to code the code-switches and lexical borrowing items of each informant according to type and then calculate the proportionate numbers for 100 minutes of interview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Number of CSs</th>
<th>Number of LBs</th>
<th>Interview Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitoria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>893</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant</td>
<td>Number of CSs</td>
<td>Interview minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitoria</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>709</strong></td>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V

LEXICAL BORROWING IN RAW NUMBERS PER 100 INTERVIEW MINUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Number of LBs</th>
<th>Interview minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitoria</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4. **Coding the Data**

4.3.4.1.1. **Code-Switches**

First, code-switches were coded according to their position in the sentence, i.e., intrasentential, intersentential, extra-sentential (refer to pages 7 to 11 for an explanation on each type). Intrasentential code-switches were sub-classified into single-noun switches (SNSs) and other (OT). The latter was a subcategory created to encompass switches of grammatical categories (e.g., noun phrases, verbs, verb phrases) that are more complex to plug into a sentence, and thus require a higher level of proficiency in the language of the code-switch, than single nouns. Types and subtypes of code-switches made by each participant were counted and turned into comparable numbers through cross-multiplication. Like the total CS rates, individual numbers for each CS type had to be put over the same denominator (i.e., 100 interview minutes). The final numbers were added to the informants’ individual profiles for the quantitative analysis (Table VI). Unlike the total CS rates per participant, the rates of each CS type per participant were not rounded up in order to facilitate the calculations.

Table VI shows that Olivia’s CS rates are too high if compared with those of other informants and seemed to affect numbers in the group analysis. Therefore, her numbers were excluded from the group analysis.
## TABLE VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th><strong>Intra</strong></th>
<th><strong>SNSs</strong></th>
<th><strong>OT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Inter</strong></th>
<th><strong>Extra</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total CSs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>86.48</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>48.94</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>37.28</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitoria</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>540.37</td>
<td>245.69</td>
<td>294.66</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>92.93</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4.1.2. **Lexical Borrowing**

Instances of lexical borrowing in the data were given a similar treatment to that of code-switches. They were first coded according to type, i.e. loanwords and loanshifts. Briefly put, the former refers to loans with full or partial morphemic composition deriving from English (e.g., *maniola* for English ‘money order’, *parquear* for English ‘to park’ and *bumpizinho* for English ‘small bump’), whereas the latter refers to loans with Brazilian Portuguese morphology, but whose meanings derive from English (e.g., *deixar alguém saber* for English ‘to let someone know’, and *aplicar* for English ‘to apply (for a job/position). For a full explanation and further examples, please refer to pages 14-18.

The number of loanwords and loanshifts were counted, and 13 loanwords and 88 loanshifts for the original 893 interview minutes were found. The same proportion calculations were made in order to find their equivalent numbers for 2000 minutes of interview (i.e., 100 minutes per informant). Then, the equivalent numbers (28 and 198, respectively) were distributed per informant (Table VII).

Unlike CS rates, for which Olivia’s were much higher than the other informants’ and thus hers were excluded from the quantitative analysis, none of the individual LB rates seems to differ markedly from the rest of the group. Therefore, all individual LB rates were used in the quantitative analysis.
TABLE VII
INDIVIDUAL RATES OF LEXICAL BORROWING TYPES IN RAW NUMBERS PER 100 INTERVIEW MINUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Number of Loanwords</th>
<th>Number of Loanshifts</th>
<th>Total LBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitoria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>198.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5. Testing Correlations

After CS and LB rates per 100 interview minutes for each informant were found, the next step was to test the possible correlation between age of English onset and/or length of English exposure on the one hand, and CS types (i.e., intrasentential and its subtypes, SNSs and OT; intersentential, extra-sentential) and LB types (i.e., loanwords and loanshifts) on the other.

For the first correlation test, informants were organized by age of English onset in an ascending order as a continuous independent variable, and then a correlation coefficient for each type of CS was calculated. Coefficients of 0.5 to 1.0 or -0.5 to -1.0 are indexical of a correlation, whereas numbers higher or lower indicate a lack of correlation.

The same procedure was followed for the length of exposure to English. Informants were organized by number of years of exposure in an ascending order as a continuous independent variable and then a correlation coefficient for each CS type was calculated.

The procedure above was repeated for types lexical borrowing.
5. RESULTS

A total of 319 unambiguous instances of code-switching and 101 unambiguous instances of lexical borrowing were found in a total of 893 interview minutes (i.e., interview raging 28-82 minutes per informant). The proportionate CS and LB numbers for 2000 interview minutes (i.e., 100 minutes per informant) were 709 and 226, respectively. These numbers demonstrate that, as a whole, the group produced more instances of code-switching than lexical borrowing.

5.1. Code-Switching

Analyzing the linguistic behavior of each participant is not the aim of this study. However, some interesting findings at the individual level may be worth reporting.

A brief look at Table IV in the previous section reveals that Olivia is by far the top code-switcher (132), being followed by Maria (60), Daniela (58), Fernando (57) and Alexandre (54), whereas Joana (9), Carlos (4) and Roberto (3) have the lowest CS rates in the group.

Olivia’s code-switching behavior differs considerably from other participants such as Teresa and Vicente. Table VI shows that that Olivia is engaging in higher rates of intrasentential CS (86.48) than intersentential (31.86) and extra-sentential (13.66), in this order, similar to the fluent bilinguals in Poplack (1980). Besides, if we look at her numbers for the subtypes of intrasentential CS, she is engaging in more OT code-switches (e.g., noun phrases, verb phrases) than SNSs, indexing a high level of proficiency in both Portuguese and English, especially because no violation to either language was made in any of her CSs. According to her linguistic background, Olivia could be indeed regarded as a true bilingual - she has been exposed to English
since 5 years of age, always attended schools in which English was the sole medium of instruction, moved to the U.S. to obtain her university degree and has been living in the host country for 30 years. On the other hand, all code-switches (15) that Teresa made were intrasentential; yet, the majority (12) consists of SNSs, the easiest grammatical category to plug into a sentence. While none of her OT CSs violated any grammar rules, her CS pattern differs from Olivia’s and are indexical of a linguistic background completely different from Olivia’s. Indeed, Teresa started learning English as an adult in both EFL and ESL contexts, moved to the U.S. in her mid-20’s and has been living in the host country for a little over 15 years.

Unlike the two female informants, Vicente’s extra-sentential CS rates (25) were much higher than his intrasentential (5) and intersentential (0) rates, with more SNSs than OT switches. His CS pattern looks similar to that of Poplack’s (1980) informants with lower L2 proficiency, who engaged in more extra-sentential CSs, easier type to insert into a sentence than intrasentential switches. Vicente was first exposed to English when he moved to the U.S. at the age of 23. Never having attended ESL classes, he learned English informally and has been living in the host country for almost 50 years.

The first research question in the present study aimed to investigate which of the sociolinguistic factors in focus - age of English onset and length of English exposure - were possibly correlated with types of code-switching among the group of Brazilian Portuguese/English bilingual informants. Two hypotheses were formulated and results are described in the next sections.
5.1.1. **Age of English Onset**

Hypothesis 1 addressed age of English onset and proposed that the earlier the BP/English bilinguals, informants of this study, started learning English, the greater their preference for intrasentential code-switching, especially the OT type, which requires a higher level of proficiency in the language of the code-switch than simply plugging SNSs into a sentence. However, a low coefficient (-0.07) demonstrates that there is no such correlation between age of English onset and intrasentential CS (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Number of intrasentential code-switches per age of English onset.](image-url)
The subtypes of intrasentential CS were also tested for a correlation with age of English onset. Low correlation coefficients of 0.16 and -0.28 for SNSs and OT type, respectively, point to a lack of correlation between age of English onset and both subtypes of intrasentential CS (Figures 2 and 3).

Figure 2. Number of single-noun switches per age of English onset.
In addition, hypothesis 1 proposed that the later BP/English bilinguals had been first exposed to English, the greater their preference for extra-sentential CS. Coefficients of 0.56 for intersentential CS and 0.27 for extra-sentential CS point to a correlation between age of English onset and intersentential CS (Figure 4), but to a lack of correlation with extra-sentential CS (Figure 5). In other words, the later informants of this study were first exposed to English, the higher rates of intersentential CS they produced - not the higher extra-sentential rates as expected.
Figure 4. Number of intersentential code-switches per age of English onset.

Figure 5. Number of extra-sentential code-switches per age of English onset.
5.1.2. **Length of English Exposure**

Hypothesis 2 addressed length of English exposure and predicted that the longer the BP/English bilinguals, informants of this study, had been exposed to English, the greater their preference for intrasentential code-switching, especially the OT type, which requires a higher level of proficiency in the language of the code-switch than simply plugging SNSs into sentences. Coefficients of -0.12 for intrasentential CS, -0.12 for SNS, and 0.09 for OT, were too low to prove a positive relationship between length of exposure to English, and intrasentential CS (figure 6) and its subtypes (figures 7 and 8).

![Figure 6. Number of intrasentential code-switches by years of English exposure.](image-url)
Figure 7. Number of single-noun switches per years of English exposure.

Figure 8. Number of other-type switches per years of English exposure.
Additionally, hypothesis 2 proposed that the shorter exposure to English speakers had experienced, the greater their preference for extra-sentential CS type. Coefficients of -0.14 and 0.64 index a lack of relationship between this length of exposure and intersentential CS (Figure 9), but a positive relationship to extra-sentential CS (Figure 10). That is, the longer informants of this study were exposed to English, the higher their rates of extra-sentential CS, the CS type that requires a lower level of bilingual proficiency. This result does not fulfill hypothesis 2, which predicts the opposite: the less time BP/English bilinguals had been exposed to English, the greater their preference for extra-sentential CS.

Figure 9. Number of intersentential code-switches per years of English exposure.
5.2. **Lexical Borrowing**

As a whole, the group produced more instances of loanshifts than loanwords. At the individual level, a brief look at Table VII shows that Bianca (31), Daniela (27), Olivia (23) and Cecilia (20) are informants with the highest LB rates, whereas Helena (2) and Roberto (0) have the lowest LR rates. It is noteworthy here that Olivia and Daniela are among the list of top code-switchers as well as among the top lexical borrows, whereas Roberto is at the bottom of both lists, having the lowest CS and LB rates.

The second research question aimed to investigate which of the sociolinguistic factors in focus - age of English onset and length of English exposure - were possibly correlated with types of lexical borrowing among the group of Brazilian Portuguese/English bilingual informants.
Unlike code-switching, no predictions were made for either age of English onset or length of English exposure.

5.2.1. **Age of English Onset**

Low coefficients (0.026 and -0.28) show that age of English onset is not correlated with the use of either loanwords (Figure 11) or loanshifts (Figure 12).

![Figure 11. Number of loanwords per age of English onset.](image-url)
5.2.2. **Length of English Exposure**

A low coefficient (-0.26) points to a lack of correlation between length of English exposure and loanwords (Figure 13). No correlation between length of exposure and use of loanshifts was found either (Figure 14); however, it is noteworthy that the correlation coefficient (0.46) almost reached the 0.5 minimum.
A summary of the correlation coefficients can be found in Table VIII.
### TABLE VIII

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS:
AGE OF ENGLISH ONSET AND LENGTH OF ENGLISH EXPOSURE,
VERSUS CODE-SWITCHING AND LEXICAL BORROWING TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age of English onset</th>
<th>Length of English exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code-switching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrasentential</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersentential</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-sentential</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td><strong>0.64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical Borrowing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loanwords</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loanshifts</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. DISCUSSION

6.1. Implications

The first research question in this study intended to investigate which of the sociolinguistic factors in focus - age of English onset and length of English exposure - were possibly correlated with code-switching types among the group of Brazilian Portuguese/English bilingual informants. For that, the author made two predictions. The first proposed that the earlier informants had been first exposed to English, the greater their preference for intrasentential type of code-switching; and the later informants had been first exposed to English, the greater their preference for extra-sentential code-switching. The second prediction suggested that the longer informants had been exposed to English, the greater their preference for intrasentential type of code-switching; and the shorter the length of English exposure, the greater the informants’ preference for extra-sentential code-switching.

Results discussed in the previous section have shown that neither prediction has been fulfilled. However, two correlations were found: one between age of English onset and a preference for intersentential code-switching, and the other between length of English exposure and a preference for extra-sentential code-switching.

The correlation between age of English onset and a preference for intersentential type of code switching means that the later informants of this study were first exposed to English, the greater their preference for intersentential code-switches. Such finding seems to support partially those of Poplack (1980). While Poplack’s informants who had a lower level of bilingual ability engaged more frequently in extra-sentential CS - regarded as the easiest CS type -, it seems
reasonable to say that both extra-sentential and intersentential CS types involve a bilingual maneuver that poses a lesser risk of violating grammatical rules than intrasentential CS. While extra-linguistic code-switches are more syntactically independent, code-switching from one sentence to another - and from one clause to another, to a certain extent - entails as little risk of grammar violation as the plugging of tags, fillers, interjections and fixed expressions of an embedded language into a base language. Classifying types of intersentential code-switching (i.e., if they occur between sentences or clauses, and in the latter case, the types of clauses involved - main, subordinate, etc.) and identifying the functions that they serve (e.g., reported speech, change in topic) are beyond the scope of this study. Future studies on the BP/English bilingual community in Chicagoland might look into the effects of age of English onset on types of intersentential code-switching and their functions.

The correlation between length of English exposure and extra-sentential code-switching reveals a result opposite to what was expected, i.e., the longer - not the less – some informants of this study were exposed to English, the greater their preference for extra-sentential code-switching. This finding may point to two hypotheses. First, length of exposure may not be a predictor of bilingual ability, while age of English onset - which had a correlation with intersentential CS- is. Second, it may be that age of English onset is indirectly having an effect on the preference for extra-sentential CS in this study. The reason being, the three informants producing the highest numbers of extra-sentential code-switches started learning English after 13 years of age.

It may be that considering the length of exposure to English before informants immigrated to the U.S. (i.e., the years of EFL studies in Brazil) along with the length of U.S. residence could have possibly had an effect on the present results. Future studies on the effects of length of L2 exposure and CS types, especially within BP/English bilingual communities, may consider both
periods of time (i.e., length of residence in the host country only; and length of residence in the host country along with length of EFL studies in the home country) in order to verify if contact with the bilingual community may play a role in a possible correlation between length of exposure and a preference for CS types.

Nevertheless, the fact that both predictions in this study were contradicted may provide evidence that each bilingual/multilingual community is unique and thus patterns of bilingual behavior, as well as the sociolinguistic factors correlated with them, may vary considerably across communities. Unlike the Puerto-Ricans in Poplack (1980), the Brazilian community in Chicagoland is not concentrated in a well-defined area (e.g., there is no Brazilian neighborhood, block or corner; no bilingual schools offer instruction in Portuguese) and thus its members may not interact with one another in similar social circumstances as Poplack’s Puerto-Ricans. In addition, it may be that sociolinguistic variables other than bilingual ability, age of English onset and length of English exposure could be influencing the bilingual behavior of this group of informants. Therefore, it may be fruitful for future studies on BP/English bilinguals in Chicagoland to test other sociolinguistic variables (e.g., age, gender, occupation, social class, ethnic identity, language dominance) that might be correlated with a preference for types of code-switching.

The second research question in this study intended to investigate which of the sociolinguistic factors in focus - age of English onset and length of English exposure - were possibly correlated with a preference for loanwords or loanshifts among the group of Brazilian Portuguese/English bilingual informants.

Age of English onset and length of exposure to English were found to have no effects on the preference for loanwords or loanshifts by the BP/English bilinguals in this study. Although no predictions were made, this result seems to contradict, to some extent, findings by Otheguy et al.
(1989). In their study of Cuban Spanish/English bilinguals, U.S.-born informants - exposed to English at a very early age - were using more loanshifts than loanwords and also more loanwords than their first-generation counterparts. Future studies on BP/English bilinguals in Chicagoland might look into other sociolinguistic variables (e.g., generation, language dominance) that might be correlated with a preference for types of lexical borrowing.

Although counting the frequency of each instance of loanword or loanshift is beyond the scope of this study, the high frequency with which certain words/expressions were used by informants or mentioned to have been heard from other members of the bilingual community (e.g., aplicar, parquear, printar) point to the need for further studies that can systematically identify borrowings that have become established in the speech repertoire of BP/English bilinguals in Chicagoland - and even in the U.S., if a large scale study could be possibly conducted. Studies of this type could empirically demonstrate the natural process of displacement of words/expressions from monolingual varieties of a language and thus help destigmatize the “variety” or “varieties” of Brazilian Portuguese (and of other minority languages) spoken by bilinguals in situations of immigration.

Additional themes, which may be worthy of further investigation, have arisen in the data. One is the other direction of code-switching (i.e., English as the base language and Portuguese as the embedded language) by second-generation BP/English bilinguals. Another is the influence of the Portuguese spoken by second-generation BP/English children on the Portuguese of their first-generation parents, a phenomenon known as substratum influence. Such theme was reported by some informants who acknowledged their frequent use of English-modelled expressions/structures produced by their bilingual children. Another noteworthy point is the perception of cross-cultural linguistic differences reported by some informants (e.g., thank-you acts, telephone conversation
closings), which might be used as food for thought for future cross-cultural studies of speech acts between English and Portuguese.

The speech repertoire of multilingual informants in this study contained code-switches and instances of LB from languages other than English (e.g., French, Spanish, and Italian). Spanish is the second most widely spoken language in Chicagoland and studies on the effects of this romance language on the Portuguese spoken in this area (and vice-versa) may be relevant to the field. Finally, it was noticed that the code-switches produced by the group of informants were at times smooth, other times marked by flagging (e.g., repetition, translation, long pauses, and metalinguistic commentary). Therefore, it might be worth looking into this phenomenon in further detail in order to investigate other patterns of bilingual behavior in the Portuguese repertoire of BP/English bilinguals in Chicagoland.

6.2. Limitations

One limitation of this study is the sampling method used to recruit participants. Snowball sampling is a good solution to recruit volunteers when access to the group under investigation may present a problem and/or when research resources are limited. However, it may bias the sample as informants may come from the same pool of people, which may raise issues of representativeness of the community under investigation. Although the goal of investigating the behavior of members of a speech community is to gain access to the overall linguistic patterns of such community, the present study never attempted to provide a comprehensive account of the CS and LB behavior of the BP/English bilingual community in Chicagoland. Instead, it intended to provide a descriptive account of the CS and LB behavior of the group of BP/English bilinguals, informants of this study,
and thus gain a preliminary window into the linguistic behavior of this never-studied (to the best of the author’s knowledge) speech community.

Another limitation of this study is the small size of the data. Studies on CS and LB of major relevance to the field (e.g., Poplack, 1980; Poplack et al., 1988; Poplack, 1989; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Treffers-Daller, 1994) have relied on multiple interviews/observations of informants and longer hours of recorded interactions. Having said that, the author has conducted this research study to the best of her abilities given its limited resources.

As pointed out by Poplack (1993), conditions during the sociolinguistic interview may help yield or hinder the linguistic behavior(s) under investigation. First, informants must perceive the interviewer as an in-group member, and one fruitful way of achieving that effect is by displaying the same type(s) of bilingual behavior. Second, the interviewer must adopt a conversational style in order to keep the interaction as informal as possible and thus yield the use of vernacular language by informants. Although the interviewer (the author) is herself a BP/English bilingual resident of Chicagoland and ensured that conditions during the interviews favored the use of CS and LB, it may be that participants did not perceive her as an in-group member and thus code-switched less and borrowed less from English. Collecting sociolinguistic data requires a great deal of time and, oftentimes, researchers do not have ideal resources at their disposal. That said, future studies on the bilingual behavior of BP/English residents of Chicagoland may count on more than one “skilled” interviewer - also in-group members - that would take turns conducting more than one interview with each informant. This might increase the chances of creating the perfect conditions for CS and LB to occur.
6.3. Conclusion

The results obtained in the present study confirm that code-switching and lexical borrowing are both linguistic behaviors inherent to the speech repertoire of bilinguals in situations of immigration - and not signs of imperfect command of either language. They are present in the speech of individuals whose references come from two varying cultures and who have access to two different linguistic systems, which they can benefit from when communicating.

Correlations found in this study lend partial or no support to previous studies on code-switching and lexical borrowing, confirming the view that each bilingual/multilingual community has unique linguistic patterns and that factors correlated with such patterns may vary across communities.

Results obtained in this small-scale study obviously cannot predict the future of Portuguese as a minority language in the United States. Yet, it can provide a glimpse of linguistic patterns that can serve as a point of departure for future studies on BP/English communities not only in Chicagoland, but also in other areas of the U.S.
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Appendix A – Initial recruitment script

Recruitment Scripts

Title: Brazilian Portuguese among Portuguese/English Bilinguals in Chicagoland

Investigator and Affiliations:

Principal Investigator: Silvia Fortuna Dias
MA student
Department of Linguistics
601 Morgan Street
M/C 315
312-718-7394
sfortu2@uic.edu

Faculty Advisor: Richard Cameron
Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics
601 Morgan Street
M/C 315
312-996-3241
rcameron@uic.edu

Date: 7/26/16  Version: 1
In the recruitment phase, Dias will visit Brazilian related institutions (e.g., religious, governmental, cultural and not-for profit) where Brazilians meet and congregate on a regular basis.

Dias will introduce herself to potential informants as a graduate student and researcher of UIC, explain the research and ask if the subject is 18 years of age or older, resident of Chicagoland and bilingual in Brazilian Portuguese and English. If subject says yes to all answers, he/she will be eligible to participate in the sociolinguistic interview. If the person volunteers to be a research subject, Dias will schedule the interview with him/her and/or leave Dias’ contact information (phone number and/or email address) for subject to get in touch with Dias to schedule interview. It is at the subject’s discretion to leave his/her contact information with Dias.

Recruitment script will be as follows:

“My name is Silvia Fortuna Dias. I am a graduate student researcher at UIC. I am studying how people who speak both English and Brazilian Portuguese communicate in Chicagoland and the best way to do it is by talking to people like you. The conversation would take about 30 minutes to 3 hours and we could have this talk anywhere and anytime of your choice. You can also bring one or more adults to participate in this interview with you. There are no direct benefits and you will not receive any payment for your participation. First, I need to ask you some questions to see if you are eligible. Are you ok with that?”

“Are you 18 years of age or older?”
“Can you speak both English and Brazilian Portuguese?”
“Do you live in Chicagoland?”

If subject says “yes” to all questions, Dias will explain the research in more detail:

“During our conversation, we will be talking about everyday life topics and you are free to drop any topic that I bring up and talk about topics you prefer. If something you say is used in publications and/or conferences, your name and identifying information will be changed to protect your identity and privacy. Participation is completely voluntary and you are free to decide to withdraw from the study at any point without any problems or consequences for you. Do you have any questions?” (Dias will give potential informant as much time as necessary to ask questions).

If subject volunteers to participate, he/she can schedule the interview with Dias immediately, choose to contact Dias (Dias provides him/her with her contact information or subject can leave his/her contact number for Dias to contact him/her). The method for scheduling the interview is at the volunteer’s discretion. Script as follows:

“Thank you for volunteering to participate. You can have this conversation individually, that is, you and me, or you can take one or more adult volunteers to participate in it with you. We can schedule it now. I can leave my contact information for you to contact me or you can leave me your contact information and I can contact you. It is up to you. Also, it can be at the place and time of your preference”.

Appendix B – Re-contact script

Re-contact Scripts

Title: Brazilian Portuguese among Portuguese/English Bilinguals in Chicagoland

Investigator and Affiliations:

Principal Investigator: Silvia Fortuna Dias
Faculty Advisor: Richard Cameron
MA student
Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics
Department of Linguistics
601 Morgan Street
601 Morgan Street
M/C 315
M/C 315
312-718-7394
312-996-3241
sfortu2@uic.edu
rcameron@uic.edu

Date: 7/26/16 Version: 1
There is always the risk that the audio-recording fails and/or the quality of the recording is not good enough for transcription purposes (e.g., low sound, too much unexpected background noise). Also, Labov's sociolinguistic interview principle of tangential shifting (i.e., letting the informant pursue topics of his/her preference during the interview) will be respected and, in the process, it is possible that PI might not have the opportunity (due to a time constraint or even forgetfulness) to ask demographic questions and language-attitude-related questions that are important for the research (e.g., What language(s) do you speak at home, work, etc.?; How do you feel about mixing these languages? How did you learn English/Portuguese? Which language(s) would you like your children to speak?). Therefore, a second interview might be necessary to ask the same questions (in case of problems with the recording) or to ask the questions PI was not able to bring up and that are important for the research.

Since participation in the second interview is also on a voluntary basis, it may or may not replicate the same conditions of the first one. That is, if the first interview was in a group and not all the informants volunteer to participate in the second one, the interview will be with fewer participants, and/or in a different location of the participants' choice. Informants are free to decide to participate or not as well as deciding when and where to have the second interview.

If a second interview is deemed necessary, informants will be contacted via phone or email (whichever they prefer to disclose to PI in the first interview). The script will be as follows:

"This is Silvia Fortuna Dias, research student at UIC. I would like to thank you for talking to me last time. It was very important for me to listen to your stories and experiences, but the audio-recording did not come out as expected and it is not audible enough for the study. I was wondering if we could meet again for another conversation which I will be re-recording. Please, feel free to volunteer again or not and to choose if you wish to do it individually or with one or more adults (18 years of age or older) of your choice and in the time and place of your choice. Thank you for your time."

If PI needs to ask questions PI was not able to in the first interview, the script will be:

"This is Silvia Fortuna Dias, research student at UIC. I would like to thank you for talking to me last time. It was very important for me to listen to your stories and experiences. I listened to the recording of our conversation and it was so engaging and exciting that I did not have the opportunity to talk about some other important topics for the research. I was wondering if we could meet again for another conversation which I will be re-recording. Please, feel free to volunteer again or not and to choose if you wish to do it individually or with one or more adults (18 years of age or older) of your choice and in the time and place of your choice. Thank you for your time."
Appendix C – Eligibility screening

Eligibility Screening

Title: Brazilian Portuguese among Portuguese/English Bilinguals in Chicagoland

Investigator and Affiliations:

Principal Investigator: Silvia Fortuna Dias
MA student
Department of Linguistics
601 Morgan Street
M/C 315
312-718-7394
sfortu2@uic.edu

Faculty Advisor: Richard Cameron
Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics
601 Morgan Street
M/C 315
312-996-3241
rcameron@uic.edu

Date: 7/26/16  Version: 1
Dias will assess potential subjects and determine their eligibility for the research in the recruitment process, that is, in the first contact with the potential subjects. Dias will introduce herself as a graduate student and researcher of UIC, explain the research and ask if the subject is 18 years of age or older, resident of Chicagoland and bilingual in Brazilian Portuguese and English.

If subject says yes to all answers, he/she will be eligible to participate in the sociolinguistic interview. If the person volunteers to be a research subject, Dias will schedule the interview with him/her and/or leave Dias’ contact information (phone number and/or mail address) for subject to get in touch with Dias to schedule interview. It is at the subject’s discretion to leave his/her contact information with Dias.

Eligibility script will be as follows:

“My name is Silvia Fortuna Dias. I am a graduate student researcher at UIC. I am studying how people who speak both English and Brazilian Portuguese communicate in Chicagoland and the best way to do it is by talking to people like you. The conversation would take about 30 minutes to 3 hours and we could have this talk anywhere and anytime of your choice. You can also bring one or more adults to participate in this interview with you. There are no direct benefits and you will not receive any payment for your participation. First, I need to ask you some questions to see if you are eligible. Are you ok with that?”

“Are you 18 years of age or older?”
“Can you speak both English and Brazilian Portuguese?”
“Do you live in Chicagoland?”

If subject says “yes” to all questions, Dias will explain the research in more detail, give potential informant opportunity to ask questions and, if subject volunteers to participate, he/she can schedule the interview with Dias immediately, choose to contact Dias (Dias will provide him/her with her contact information or informant can leave his/her contact number for Dias to contact him/her). The method for scheduling the interview is at the volunteer’s discretion.
Appendix D – Snowball recruitment script

Recruitment Scripts

Title: Brazilian Portuguese among Portuguese/English Bilinguals in Chicagoland

Investigator and Affiliations:

Principal Investigator: Silvia Fortuna Dias
MA student
Department of Linguistics
601 Morgan Street
M/C 315
312-718-7394
sfortu2@uic.edu

Faculty Advisor: Richard Cameron
Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics
601 Morgan Street
M/C 315
312-996-3241
rcameron@uic.edu

Date: 7/26/16 Version: 1
After the interview, PI will ask participants if they can help recruit further participants via snowball recruitment method, which will be done by word of mouth and will not entail any handouts, letters, flyers, letters or emails. At the end of the sociolinguistic interview, PI will say the following:

“It was great talking with you today. Thank you so much for helping me collect important information for this study. My plan is to speak with up to 100 people. I was wondering if you know any other adults that speak English and Portuguese and that live in Chicagoland that might like to speak with me. If you do and you wish to help me find more people, it would be great if you could give them my contact information. Potential participants need to be adults of 18 years of age or older, residents of Chicagoland and speakers of Brazilian Portuguese and English. Please, tell them participation is voluntary, there are no direct benefits or payment for participation, subjects can withdraw at any time without any problems or consequences, interview can take from 30 minutes to 3 hours and will take place in a place of subject's preference and can be carried out individually or with one or more people of his/her own choice.”
Appendix E – Consent form in English

University of Illinois at Chicago
Information and Consent Form for Participation in Social Behavioral Research

Principal Investigator: Silvia Dias, Graduate Student
Email: sfruitu2@uic.edu Phone: (312) 718-7394
Advisor: Dr. Richard Cameron (email: rcameron@uic.edu / Phone: (312) 996-3241)
Department and Institution: Department of Linguistics (MC 315), UIC
Address: 601 S Morgan, 1715 UH, Chicago, IL 60607

Why am I being asked?

- You are being asked to participate in a research study about Brazilian Portuguese among English/Portuguese bilinguals in Chicagoland.
- You are being asked because you are 18 years of age or older, live in Chicagoland and speak Brazilian Portuguese and/or English.
- Your participation is voluntary (it is your decision to participate or not) and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without affecting your relationship with UIC.
- Approximately 100 subjects may participate in this research.

Research Procedures

1. The researcher will schedule a 30-min to 3-hour interview in a location of your choice
2. This interview will be audio-recorded and it may be held with you individually or with one or two other participants' volunteers of your choice.
3. During the interview, the researcher will ask you demographic questions (e.g., age, occupation) and open-ended questions about everyday life topics.
4. You are free to drop the topics proposed by the research and talk about other topics, and also to ask the researcher to turn off the audio recorder at any point.
5. If you decide to withdraw from the study, your recordings will be destroyed.
6. If necessary, the researcher might ask you for a second interview, which you are free to decide to participate in or not, in a location of your choice.
7. The second interview will follow procedures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 above.

What are the risks and discomforts? What are the benefits?

- The interview will have no more risk of discomfort than you would experience in conversations in everyday life. However, there is the risk that a breach of privacy (others will know the subject is participating in research) and confidentiality (accidental disclosure of identifiable data) may occur.
• If your interview is held with one or more participants: although we ask everyone in the group to respect everyone’s privacy and confidentiality, and not to identify anyone in the group or repeat what is said during the group discussion, please remember that other participants in the group may accidentally disclose what was said.
• There are no direct benefits from participating in this study.

What about privacy and confidentiality?
• Only the researcher, the participants/volunteers you choose to have the interview with, and the researcher’s advisor will know that you are a research participant.
• Your audio-recording(s) will be safely stored in password protected files in the researcher’s personal computer.
• The paper forms will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s residence.
• The audio-recording(s) will be kept after the research has been completed and may be used in presentations. If used in presentations, no information that would reveal your identity will be included; however, your voice may be recognizable.

What are the costs? Will I be paid for my participation in this research?
• There are no costs to you for participating in this study.
• You will not be offered payment for being in this study.

Can I withdraw or be removed from the study?
• You are free to withdraw from the study at any time. Your audio-recording(s) will be destroyed and excluded from the study.
• The researcher also has the right to stop your participation without your consent if she believes it is in your best interest.

Who should I contact if I have questions?
• You may contact the researcher Silvia Dias at (312)718-7394 or sfortu2@uic.edu at any time if you have questions or wish to withdraw from the study.
• If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at (312) 996-1711 or 1-866-789-6215 (toll-free) or uicirb@uic.edu.

I have read the above information. I have also been given opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate voluntarily in this research study and I will be given a copy of this signed and dated form.

I □ agree to be audio recorded.
I □ decline to be audio-recorded.

Signature of Subject __________________________  Printed name of subject __________________________  Date ____________
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Appendix F – Consent form in Portuguese

Nome do IP Name: Silvia Dias
Título do Protocolo:________________________

University of Illinois at Chicago
Formulário de Consentimento para Participação em Estudo Socio-Comportamental

Investigador Principal: Silvia Dias, Aluna de Mestrado
Email: sfortu2@uic.edu Tel: (312) 718-7394
Orientador: Dr. Richard Cameron (email: rcameron@uic.edu / Tel: (312) 996-3241
Departamento e Instituição: Department of Linguistics (MC 315), UIC
Endereço: 601 S Morgan, 1715 UH, Chicago, IL 60607

Por que estou sendo convidado(a) a participar?
- Você está sendo convidado(a) a participar de um estudo sobre o português do Brasil falado por indivíduos bilingues em português e inglês, residentes na área metropolitana de Chicago.
- Você está sendo convidado(a) a participar porque você tem no mínimo 18 anos de idade, mora na área metropolitana de Chicago e fala português do Brasil e inglês.
- Sua participação é voluntária, ou seja, você decide se gostaria ou não de participar. Caso você decida não participar ou decida desligar-se deste estudo a qualquer momento, você não será penalizado e o seu relacionamento com a UIC não será, de modo algum, afetado.
- Essa pesquisa contará com a participação de aproximadamente 100 pessoas.

Procedimentos do Estudo
1. A pesquisadora agendará uma entrevista, que deve durar de 30 minutos a 3 horas, em um local de sua preferência.
2. Essa entrevista será gravada em áudio e poderá ser conduzida individualmente ou juntamente com um ou dois voluntários de sua escolha.
3. Durante a entrevista, a pesquisadora lhe fará perguntas de conteúdo demográfico (e.g., idade, profissão) e perguntas sobre temas do cotidiano.
4. Você tem toda a liberdade para se recusar a falar sobre os temas propostos pela pesquisadora e falar sobre temas de sua preferência. Você pode pedir à pesquisadora para desligar o gravador de áudio em qualquer momento durante a entrevista.
5. Caso você decida desligar-se deste estudo, suas gravações serão destruídas.
6. Se necessário, a pesquisadora poderá convidá-lo (a) a fazer uma segunda entrevista, em caráter voluntário, e em um local de sua preferência.
7. A segunda entrevista seguirá os procedimentos 1, 2, 3, 4 e 5 acima.

Quais são os riscos e desconfortos? Quais são os benefícios?
- A entrevista não envolve nenhum desconforto além daqueles presentes em conversas na vida cotidiana. Entretanto, há o risco de violação de privacidade que outros podem vir a saber de sua
participação neste estudo) e confidencialidade (divulgação acidental de dados que o (a) identifiquem).

- Se a sua entrevista for em grupo, lembre-se de que, apesar da pesquisadora pedir a todos os participantes que respeitem a privacidade de todos e a confidencialidade dos assuntos discutidos durante a entrevista, existe a possibilidade de divulgação acidental do conteúdo da entrevista e dos nomes dos participantes.
- A sua participação neste estudo não lhe trará nenhum benefício direto.

Como a minha privacidade e a confidencialidade do estudo serão mantidas?

- Somente a pesquisadora, os voluntários com quem você fizer a sua entrevista (se escolher esta opção), e o professor orientador saberão de sua participação.
- Suas gravações serão armazenadas no computador pessoal da pesquisadora em arquivos protegidos por senha.
- Os formulários serão armazenados em um arquivo protegido com chave na residência da pesquisadora.
- As gravações serão mantidas após a conclusão da pesquisa e poderão ser usadas em apresentações. Se usadas em apresentações, não conterão nenhuma informação que possa revelar a sua identidade. Entretanto, sua voz poderá ser reconhecida.

Quais são os custos? Haverá remuneração?

- Não há custos para participar deste estudo.
- Você não será remunerado pela participação neste estudo.

Eu posso me desligar ou ser desligado deste estudo?

- Você pode se desligar do estudo em qualquer momento. As suas gravações serão destruídas e excluídas do estudo.
- A pesquisadora também pode decidir desligá-lo do estudo se necessário.

Se eu tiver dúvidas?

- Favor entrar em contato com a pesquisadora Silvia Dias através do telefone (312) 718-7394 ou email sfortu2@uic.edu a qualquer hora.
- Se você tiver dúvidas sobre os seus direitos como participante, favor entrar em contato com Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) através do telefone (312) 996-1711 ou 1-866-789-6215 (toll-free) ou email uicirb@uic.edu.

Eu declaro que li todas as informações acima e que tive a oportunidade de tirar todas as minhas dúvidas sobre este estudo. Declaro que gostaria de me voluntariar para participar deste estudo e receberá uma cópia deste formulário assim que assiná-lo.

Eu [ ] autorizo a gravação em áudio da minha entrevista.

Eu [ ] NÃO autorizo a gravação em áudio da minha entrevista.

Assinatura do participante | Nome do participante em letra de forma | Data
--- | --- | ---
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Interview Questions

Based on Labov (1984)

Principal Investigator: Silvia Dias, Graduate Student
Email: sfortu2@uic.edu Phone: (312) 718-7394
Advisor: Dr. Richard Cameron (email: rcameron@uic.edu / Phone: (312) 996-3241)
Department and Institution: Department of Linguistics (MC 315), UIC

Demography
1. What is your name?
2. What year were you born?
3. What do you do?
4. How many years of school did you get a chance to finish?
5. Where were you born?
6. When did you move to Chicago?
7. What languages do you speak?
8. How did you learn English? Portuguese?

Games
1. Going back to the time when you were a child, what were some of the games you used to play (after school, on the street)?
2. How did you play that game?
3. Who did you usually play with?
4. Do you remember a time when you had a lot of fun playing that game? Tell me about it.
5. How about team games? Did you play any? Where?
6. Do you have children? What games do they play?
7. Do you like playing games with them? Tell me about a fun time you had with them.

Family
1. How many brothers and sisters do you have?
2. Who is the youngest? The oldest?
3. Did you hang out a lot with your siblings?
4. Do you remember a funny/fun moment you had with them?
5. Did you and your family eat together? What was it like?

Marriage/Relationships
1. Where did you meet your wife/husband?
2. How did he propose? How did you propose?
3. Has he ever made you a surprise? Can you tell me about it?
4. Where did you meet your boyfriend/girlfriend?
5. Where do you guys like to go on weekends?

Work/ School
1. What do you do?
2. How long have you been working at your current company?
3. What job did you have before this one?
4. How different are they?
5. Would you like to work on something different? What?
6. Where did you go to school? Did you have many friends there?
7. Where did you guys hang around together?
8. What did/do you like to do on your time off?

City
1. Do you like living in Chicagoland?
2. How different is it from your home town?
3. What can you do here that you were not able to do in your home town?
4. Do you have many friends here?
5. What do you guys do for fun?
6. What do you think about public transportation in Chicago?
7. What do you think about city services?
8. Would you like to live somewhere else? Where?

Language
1. How often do you speak Portuguese? English? Both?
2. Which language(s) do you speak at work (home, school, to your children, friends)?
3. When do you use Portuguese? English? Both?
4. How do you feel about mixing these languages?
5. How did you learn English? Portuguese?
6. Which languages would you like your children to speak?
7. What have you been doing to raise your children bilingual?

Reference
Appendix H – IRB approval letter

OFFICE OF PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (OPHS)
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (OVC)
201 Administrative Office Building
1717 West Polk Street
Chicago, Illinois 60612-7227

Approval Notice
Initial Review (Response to Modifications)

August 15, 2016

Silvia Fortuna Dias
Linguistics
811 W. 15th Place
#507
Chicago, IL 60608
Phone: (312) 718-7394

RE: Protocol # 2016-0506
"Brazilian Portuguese among Portuguese/English Bilinguals in Chicagoland"

Dear Ms. Fortuna Dias:

Your Initial Review application (Response to Modifications) was reviewed and approved by the Expedited review process on August 3, 2016. You may now begin your research.

Please note the following information about your approved research protocol:

Please note that stamped and approved .pdfs of all recruitment and consent documents will be forwarded as an attachment to a separate email. OPRS/IRB no longer issues paper letters and stamped/approved documents, so it will be necessary to retain these emailed documents for your files for auditing purposes.

Protocol Approval Period: August 3, 2016 - August 3, 2017
Approved Subject Enrollment #: 100

Additional Determinations for Research Involving Minors: These determinations have not been made for this study since it has not been approved for enrollment of minors.

Performance Site: UIC
Sponsor: None
Research Protocol:
a) Brazilian Portuguese among Portuguese/English Bilinguals in Chicagoland; Version 3; 07/26/2016

Recruitment Materials:
a) Initial Recruitment Script; Version 1; 07/26/2016
b) Re-contact Scripts; Version 1; 07/26/2016
c) Eligibility Screening; Version 1; 07/26/2016
d) Snowball Recruitment Script; Version 1; 07/26/2016

Phone: 312-996-1711 http://www.uic.edu/depts/ovcr/opers/ FAX: 312-413-2929
Informed Consents:
   a) Consent Form (English); Version 3; 07/26/2016
   b) Consent Form (Portuguese); Version 3; 07/26/2016
   c) A waiver of documentation (verbal consent/no written signature obtained) and an alteration of consent have been granted for eligibility screening only under 45 CFR 46.117(c)(2) and 45 CFR 46.116(d) (minimal risk; no identifiable/contact information will be collected from potential subjects unless they agree to participate in the research).

Your research meets the criteria for expedited review as defined in 45 CFR 46.110(b)(1) under the following specific categories:

(6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.
(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including but not limited to research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Please note the Review History of this submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt Date</th>
<th>Submission Type</th>
<th>Review Process</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Review Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/09/2016</td>
<td>Initial Review</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td>06/06/2016</td>
<td>Modifications Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/2016</td>
<td>Response To Modifications</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td>07/09/2016</td>
<td>Modifications Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/2016</td>
<td>Response To Modifications</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td>08/03/2016</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please remember to:

→ Use your research protocol number (2016-0506) on any documents or correspondence with the IRB concerning your research protocol.

→ Review and comply with all requirements on the OPRS website under:
  "UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects"
  (http://tiger.uic.edu/depts/over/research/protocolreview/irb/policies/0924.pdf)

Please note that the UIC IRB has the prerogative and authority to ask further questions, seek additional information, require further modifications, or monitor the conduct of your research and the consent process.

Please be aware that if the scope of work in the grant/project changes, the protocol must be amended and approved by the UIC IRB before the initiation of the change.

We wish you the best as you conduct your research. If you have any questions or need further help, please contact OPRS at (312) 996-1711 or me at (312) 996-2014.

Sincerely,
Sandra Costello
Please note that stamped and approved .pdfs of all recruitment and consent documents listed below will be forwarded as an attachment to a separate email. OPRS/IRB no longer issues paper letters and stamped/approved documents, so it will be necessary to retain these emailed documents for your files for auditing purposes.

Enclosures:

1. **Informed Consent Documents:**
   a) Consent Form (Portuguese); Version 3; 07/26/2016
   b) Consent Form (English); Version 3; 07/26/2016

2. **Recruiting Materials:**
   a) Initial Recruitment Script; Version 1; 07/26/2016
   b) Re-contact Scripts; Version 1; 07/26/2016
   c) Eligibility Screening; Version 1; 07/26/2016
   d) Snowball Recruitment Script; Version 1; 07/26/2016

**cc:** Jessica Williams, Linguistics, M/C 315  
Richard Cameron (faculty advisor), Linguistics, M/C 315
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NAME: Silvia Fortuna Dias

EDUCATION: University of Illinois at Chicago, United States

*Master of Arts in Linguistics/TESOL*

Expected Graduation: July, 2017

Rio de Janeiro State University, Brazil

*Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics and Language Studies (English & Literature) & Teaching Certificate*

Graduation Date: December, 2005

Rio de Janeiro State University, Brazil

*Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics and Language Studies (Portuguese & German)*

Graduation Date: February, 2001

HONORS & AWARDS: University of Illinois at Chicago, United States

Tuition Waiver – August, 2014 to May, 2015

University of Illinois at Chicago

Graduate Assistantship – January, 2015 to present

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society, UIC Chapter

October, 2016 to present

Golden Key International Honor Society, UIC Chapter

December, 2016 to present

PRESENTATIONS: *Getting to Know Your ELL Students*, Panelist

ITBE’s 41st Annual Conference,
Naperville, IL – February, 2015

UIC’s First-Year Writing Program (FYWP) Conference,
Chicago, IL – April, 2015

UIC’s FYWP's Year-Opening Composition Conference,
Chicago, IL – August, 2015

*Effectively Implementing Social Reading Technologies in Second Language Instruction*, Co-Presenter

2016 Chicago Language Symposium, Chicago, IL – April, 2016

UIC Tech Teach, Chicago, IL – November, 2016

ITBE’s 43rd Annual Conference, Naperville, IL – February, 2017

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Portuguese Teacher, Language Loop
July, 2010 – July, 2014 – Chicago, IL

English Teacher, Cultura Inglesa
March, 2007 – December, 2008 – Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

English Teacher, Brasas English Course

English Teacher, Excel Language School
August, 2000 - August, 2002 - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

English Teacher, CCAA
March, 1997 – February, 2006 - Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

English Teacher, Escola Monte Alegre
August, 1994 – January, 2009 – Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

ENGLISH PROFICIENCY CERTIFICATION:

Certificate of Proficiency in English (CPE)
University of Cambridge - 2008

English Language Proficiency
University of Miami – 1997