A Perception Study of Rioplatense Spanish

Cecelia Staggs: McNair Scholar

Dr. Michal Temkin Martinez: Mentor

English, Linguistics Emphasis and Spanish

Abstract

Rioplatense Spanish (RPS; Argentina and Uruguay) is known for its distinctive pronunciation features. In Standard American Spanish, the sound associated with the letters ‘y’ or ‘ll’ is [j] (as in ‘yellow’), but in RPS the sound is [ʒ] (as in ‘measure’) or, more recently, [ʃ] (as in ‘shoe’). Previous studies found this sound change (from [ʒ] to [ʃ]) is almost complete in speakers from Uruguay and Argentina, but the change in Uruguay is more recent. In this study, RPS speakers from both countries were presented with audio recordings of words containing all possible variants of the sounds [j], [ʒ], and [ʃ]. After listening to the recordings, participants determined the country of origin of the speaker. We expected Argentine participants to attribute [ʃ] to Argentine Spanish, and [ʒ] to Uruguayan Spanish. Uruguayan participants were expected to attribute both [ʃ] and [ʒ] to either Argentinian or Uruguayan Spanish, unable to differentiate between the two sounds. Results show that speakers are aware of their own dialect’s shift towards [ʃ]; however, they also attribute the [ʒ] sound to speakers from across the river, unaware that both pronunciations have shifted.

Introduction

This paper reports results from a perception study examining the sound change in the phonological phenomenon of zeísmo in Rioplatense Spanish (RPS). Native RPS speakers currently residing in either Buenos Aires, Argentina or Montevideo, Uruguay participated in an online experiment in which they were presented with various pronunciations of target audio stimuli of Spanish words. Participants were asked to determine the country of origin of the speaker for each item. Results suggest that speakers’ perceptions of the sound change taking place in their region as a whole, are greatly influenced by their area of origin within the region – namely, speakers are aware of their own shift, but not the shifts seen in the other RPS speaking department. These results align well with literature on ideologies.

Background

The phenomenon of zeísmo is one of the most indicative phonetic features of Rioplatense Spanish (RPS) – the dialect spoken in the Río de la Plata region of South America which includes both Montevideo, Uruguay and Buenos Aires, Argentina. The term zeísmo refers to the pronunciation of the orthographic ‘y’ or ‘ll’ as the voiced post-alveolar fricative [ʒ] (as in ‘measure’) or the voiceless post-alveolar fricative [ʃ] (as in ‘shoe’); however, in Standard American Spanish, the sound is realized as the palatal approximant [j] (as in ‘yellow’). Many studies have shown that within the last 70 to 80 years, there has been a strong transition towards the voiceless [ʃ] in both Argentina and Uruguay, with Argentina having completed the change by 2004 and Uruguay following only recently (Barrios 2002, Temkin Martinez 2004, Wolf & Jiménez 1979, Wolf 1984, Chang 2008).

The introduction of the voiceless variant was first documented in the 1940’s in Buenos Aires during Juan Peron’s presidency (Honsa 1965). Peron was thought to be an advocate for the working class. Therefore, many lower-class Argentines moved to Buenos Aires with the hope that they would have better opportunities. This caused a growth in the lower- and working-class population in Buenos Aires, and also introduced a new pronunciation characteristic, creating a socioeconomic divide between speakers who used the voiced variant, and those who used the voiceless allophone. Therefore, in Buenos Aires in the 1940’s, the voiced variant was recognized by speakers as the prestigious pronunciation, while the voiceless sound was indicative of the working class (Honsa 1965).
Documentation of the sound inventory for the region a couple of decades after the introduction of the voiceless sound indicates that Standard RPS – spoken in both Montevideo and Buenos Aires – contained the voiced post-alveolar fricative [ʒ]. Its voiceless counterpart [ʃ], however, was only present in the sound inventory for Colloquial Buenos Aires Spanish. While the voiceless variant [ʃ] was officially recognized as belonging to the lower class in previous generations, younger members of the population across all socioeconomic classes were beginning to show a notable shift in preference towards this feature as well. Honsa (1965) attributes this rapid spread of the devoiced variant to the increase in media influence at the time. Moreover, as with most cases of language change, it was found that the devoicing in Buenos Aires was being driven by women, which created a shift in the linguistic ideologies associated with the voiced and voiceless variants (Wolf & Jiménez 1979). The voiced variant maintained its level of prestige; however, as women began to use [ʃ] more frequently in their speech, the [ʒ] also became more strongly associated with masculinity. As a result, the [ʃ] developed an association with what was thought to be ‘feminine’ speech, as well as maintaining some association with the working class (Wolf & Jiménez 1979).

Perhaps because of the feminine association with devoicing, the sound change was progressing much more gradually for the males in the older generation, as opposed to a rapid change for the female population. By 1979, the process of devoicing was nearly complete in not only the speech of women, but also in the younger generation across socioeconomic classes (Wolf & Jimenez 1979). Thus, women had modeled a new speech pattern for the younger generation, which caused the ideologies that had formed around socioeconomic class and voicing to begin to dissipate. Only a few years later, Wolf (1984) made an emerging claim that the sound change in Buenos Aires had been completed in the younger generation, and speakers were beginning to favor the voiceless variant [ʃ].

In a study conducted in 2004, Temkin Martínez provided an acoustic analysis of voicing in zeísmo in the speech of participants from Buenos Aires. Following Donni de Mirande (1991), Temkin Martínez took into consideration the presence of partial voicing. In this study, it was ascertained that female speakers in Buenos Aires were driving devoicing in zeísmo, and that devoicing in the younger generation was already complete, thus supporting previous findings (Wolf 1984). In addition, it was also found that the younger population devoiced most often, and that the middle-aged population in Buenos Aires was most likely to at least partially devoice the post-alveolar; coinciding with the findings in Donni de Mirande (1991). The study also finds that in the early 2000’s, the difference between the two segments was no longer associated with socioeconomic class, but only with gender.

Chang (2008) further determined that the only remaining speakers in Buenos Aires that consistently and nearly exclusively realized the segment as voiced were born before 1945, while participants that were born after 1975 almost exclusively preferred the voiceless variant. This further supports Honza’s (1965) findings regarding the first introduction of the voiceless variant in Buenos Aires. This study also concluded that the younger population realized the segment as the devoiced [ʃ], and as a result, created a shift in social ideologies from those associated with gender, to ideologies centered on age. Additionally, Chang (2008) supports others’ claims (Donni de Mirande 1991, Wolf & Jimenez 1979, Wolf 1984) stating that age has become the influential social factor in determining who will devoice. His study finds that there was no effect of gender and that both males and females from the younger generation preferred the [ʃ] variant in almost every instantiation. Rohena-Madrazo (2013) also finds that there is no significant effect of gender, further supporting the diminishing influence of gender on voicing of the segment in zeísmo.

As speakers in Buenos Aires made this shift towards the voiceless [ʃ], speakers in Montevideo were still favoring the voiced [ʒ] and did not begin the devoicing process in zeísmo until several decades later. As recently as 2002, the devoicing of the post-alveolar fricative in Montevideo started to show a transition in the female population, and an even stronger transition in the younger generation. Barrios (2002) found that the sound change in Montevideo was also undergoing social ideological changes, similarly to the changes that were undergone in Buenos Aires a few decades earlier – namely, as the change began to progress rapidly in the female population across socioeconomic classes, the stereotype associated with devoicing became less related to prestige, and more with femininity. Additionally, it was found that the sound change then transitioned, making [ʃ] indicative of the younger generation, while [ʒ] was still commonly found in, and strongly associated with, the older generation in Montevideo.

Barrios (2002) claims that at this time in Montevideo, many speakers were attributing the increase in usage of the devoiced variant to the influence of Argentine television broadcasted in Uruguay. This belief demonstrates that speakers from Buenos Aires had not only established this pronunciation feature as part of their local RPS dialect but they were also assigned and recognized by those residing in the other capital region as having a slight difference from Montevideo speakers. Furthermore, the shift in these ideological changes from stereotypes in prestige, to gender, and then to age – in both countries – represents that speakers from Montevideo were undergoing this language change in the same consistent pattern that was demonstrated by speakers in Buenos Aires. This was occurring across socioeconomic classes which created a shift in both Buenos Aires and Montevideo – at different points in time – from a stigmatized divide of prestige, gender, and age between the voiced and voiceless variants in
their dialect, to an increasingly destigmatized and nearly standardized preference towards the voiceless [ʃ]. Barrios (2002) aimed to determine if RPS speakers were aware of this shift in pronunciation and standardization they were undergoing. This heightened conscious or unconscious acceptance of the voiceless variant is a result of how commonly it was used by the younger generation. Barrios (2002) also found that the younger generation had less self-awareness of the presence of [ʃ] and almost no negative connotations towards its usage; further supporting its progression towards being “normalized”.

The literature supports that the devoicing in jeísmo has progressed similarly in each RPS speaking capital region, with Argentina preceding Uruguay. Recent studies determine that the sound change is still in progress in Montevideo with current social ideologies attributing the growing influence and implementation of the voiceless variant [ʃ] to the younger generation. However, speakers in Buenos Aires have already been determined to have completed the sound change. Speakers’ awareness of the sound change and its prevalence can provide a window to their language ideologies about it (Kroskrity 2004).

Aims and hypotheses of the current study

The present study was designed to examine RPS speakers’ perceptions of the recent and current sound change their dialect is undergoing. Namely, we hope to determine first, if speakers are aware of the status of the significant transition that has taken place in their local dialect within the last 70-80 years. Secondly, we hope to determine if they are aware that it is becoming less common to hear the voiced variant in daily speech due to the complete change in Buenos Aires and the nearly complete change in Montevideo. This examination of speakers’ perceptions is motivated by the potential to provide evidence that can further the study of whether language ideologies have transitioned along with the sound change. The hypotheses for this study are outlined in (1).

(1) Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1** Participants, independent of capital region, will more frequently attribute the voiced post-alveolar fricative [ʒ] to Uruguayan speech.

**Hypothesis 2** The capital region in which participants attribute the voiceless post-alveolar [ʃ] will be dependent on the capital region of origin of the participant.

a. Argentine participants will more frequently select ‘Argentina’ when the audio stimulus contains the voiceless variant [ʃ].

b. Uruguayan participants will inconsistently select ‘Argentina’ or ‘Uruguay’ when the audio stimulus contains [ʃ].

**Methodology and Design**

Data for the current perception study was collected by recruiting Native RPS speakers currently residing in either Buenos Aires or Montevideo to participate in an online perception study. Participants were presented with recorded sentences containing target words with varying pronunciations of the target segment (either [ʒ], [ʃ], or [j]). After listening to each audio stimulus, participants were asked to determine the country of origin of the speaker, with their options being: ‘Argentina’, ‘Uruguay’, ‘Argentina o Uruguay’, or ‘Otro’ (‘other’).

**Stimuli**

Stimuli for the experiment consisted of 80 disyllabic words. Following the 3:1 ratio for fillers-to-target tokens, the list contained 20 target tokens and 60 fillers. In order to eliminate confounding variables and examine speakers’ perceptions, target words were carefully controlled for stress, word length, and environment of the target segment – all words contained at least one instantiation of the vowel [a]. Target tokens contained the segment in question (realized as either [ʒ], [ʃ], or [j]) in word-initial or word-medial (intervocalic) position. Sample target and filler stimuli are in (2), with a full list of stimuli in Appendix A.
Sample and filler stimuli and their environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Token Environments</th>
<th>Sample token</th>
<th>Filler Environments</th>
<th>Sample filler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># _a</td>
<td>Llave (‘key’)</td>
<td>o/e _a</td>
<td>Bota (‘hoot’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o/e _a</td>
<td>Sella (‘stamp’)</td>
<td>a _o/e</td>
<td>Dado (‘given’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a _o/e</td>
<td>Mayo (‘May’)</td>
<td>a _o/e</td>
<td>Dado (‘given’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a _a</td>
<td>Playa (‘beach’)</td>
<td>a _a</td>
<td>Rana (‘frog’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 44-year-old male, native RPS speaker from the Buenos Aires province of Argentina was recorded to create the stimuli. Recordings were made using a Zoom H4n Pro recorder and a Shure SM10A head-mounted unidirectional microphone in a sound attenuated room in the Mary Ellen Ryder Linguistics Lab at Boise State University. Each of the target tokens were recorded three times – one iteration for each of the three possible variants of the target segment ([ʒ], [ʃ], or [j]).

The 80 stimuli were first randomized, and then pseudorandomized to lower the possibility of priming effects. Three lists were made, using a combination of target words containing the three variants, but only one iteration of each target word was used so that none is heard twice by the same participant. For example, the Spanish word ‘llama’ was presented in each list. However, in List 1 it was presented as [jama], in List 2 it was [ʒama] and in List 3 [ʃama]. Appendix B includes each of the three lists with the variant used for each target token demonstrated.

Participants

A total of 95 RPS speakers between the ages of 18 and 70 participated in the online study. In the demographic survey following the study, participants were asked to report on their age range, as well as city of birth and places of residence. Participants were also given the option to report gender; however, due to their inconsistencies in choosing to report this piece of demographic data, it was not considered in the analysis that follows. Due to previous findings, (Chang 2008, Rohena-Madrazo 2013), we expect that the exclusion of gender should not affect the results. Along with participants who did not finish the online study, participants who reported to have been born elsewhere but currently residing in either area, or those that reported to live outside of the targeted capital regions in either country, were excluded from the analysis. An additional participant, who selected ‘other’ for the majority of the tokens, was also not considered in the analysis. After excluding these participants, data from 71 participants were admissible for analysis.

Of the 71 participants, 28 were within the ‘young’ (18-34) age range, 41 participants were within the ‘mid’ (35-59) age range and two participants were in the ‘old’ (60+) age range. Thirty-three of the participants reported to be from the Buenos Aires capital region, while 38 reported to be from the Montevideo capital region. Participants were asked to report their city of birth and all of the cities they had resided in during their lifetime to filter out participants that were not native to the region and who could potentially skew the data.

Procedure

Participants were recruited online using three different methods: through various Facebook pages local to both the Buenos Aires and Montevideo regions, a Facebook ad that targeted people from Buenos Aires and Montevideo, and using a snow ball effect by word of mouth from different connections to people living in Montevideo or Buenos Aires. The online link led participants to select one of three shapes on a blank web page, with each shape linking to a Qualtrics survey using one of the three lists mentioned in Section 3.1. The three lists were monitored throughout the time the survey was available to ensure that the distribution of participants was nearly equal between them. At the end of the experiment, List 1 received 21 responses, List 2 received 26 responses and List 3 received 24 responses.

Results

Looking across all participants, we find that speakers’ perceptions of the two variants make it difficult to attribute either sound to a particular capital region within the larger Rio de la Plata region. This contradicts Hypothesis 1, since it was not the case that the voiced variant [ʒ] was more frequently ascribed to Uruguayan speech.
than to Argentine speech, independent of participant origin. In (3) we see this contradiction with either variant being equally likely to be attributed to a given region.

(3) All participant data by sound

This identical pattern between the two sounds is confirmed by results from a repeated measures ANOVA showing that there is no main effect of sound ($F(1, 949) = 0.229, p = 0.633$), since no particular sound could be attributed to a particular population.

When examining participants’ perceptions of the voiced variant $\zeta$, while taking into consideration participants’ city of origin, it is evident that participants were actually more likely to attribute the voiced variant to Argentina than Uruguay, negating Hypothesis 1. This illustrates that participants are not aware of the fact that the voiced variant is no longer commonly present in the speech of RPS speakers in Buenos Aires. This can be seen in (4).

(4) Perception of $\zeta$ by origin

Looking at the voiceless variant $\s$, however, we see that region of origin actually highly influences participants’ responses, with both groups attributing the variant to their respective group – showing that there is some awareness to the sound change in their local dialect.
This correlation is corroborated in the analysis with a significant interaction between sound and origin of the participant ($F (1, 949) = 7.540, p = 0.006$). The charts in (4) and (5) illustrate that participants are most likely to attribute the voiceless variant to their respective region of origin within the larger Rio de la Plata region.

Since participants’ choices differed based on their responses to the two different variants, there was a main effect of origin ($F (1, 949) = 52.114, p < 0.001$). Hypothesis 2 is supported by the data reported in (6). Recall that the hypothesis states that Argentine participants were expected to attribute the voiceless variant to their speech and more frequently attribute the voiced variant to Uruguayan speech, while Uruguayan participants would be more likely to attribute the voiceless sound to both their speech and Argentine speech, and attribute the voiced variant to their speech patterns.

It can be seen that the country of origin significantly affected participants’ perceptions of where each variant is being employed. The charts in (6) further support this previously mentioned claim by illustrating that Argentine participants tended to attribute the voiceless variant to their own speech, while Uruguays tended to claim the voiceless sound as their own. This demonstrates that speakers have an awareness of the progression towards devoicing; however, they are still unaware of just how advanced the sound change is.
In addition to the significant interaction of origin and sound, there was also a significant interaction of sound, origin, and age ($F (2, 949) = 3.478, p < 0.031$), as well as age and origin ($F (2, 949) = 10.759, p < 0.001$). This is seen in (7).

(7) Sound, age, and origin

This indicates that regardless of whether the individual was still developing linguistically or not when they were introduced to the voiceless variant, the sound change has been influential enough to dilute the effect of some preexisting ideologies. The incongruence between members of the same age group across capital regions, comparing the top figure with the bottom one in (7), also aligns with the timing differences between the sound changes in the different regions.

Discussion

The results of this study call into question the status of the social ideologies associated with the devoicing in zeísmo. Recent studies (Barrios 2002, Rohena-Madrazo 2013) have provided inconclusive data on whether or not speakers are aware of the difference in voicing, and those that reported to be aware had differing opinions. However, the findings in this study support the claim that speakers are at least aware of the shift their own capital region has undergone, while they had differing opinions on the status of the devoicing in the other region. While previous
research (Honsa 1965, Wolf & Jimenez 1979, Barrios 2002) on the sound change has acknowledged the presence of language ideologies, these studies have failed to substantially address their presence and transition throughout the progression of the sound change. This gap in the literature provides an opportunity for further explicit research on speakers’ language ideologies related to the devoicing in zeísmo.

Conclusion

In this paper, we detail a perception experiment designed to determine native Rioplatense Spanish speakers’ perceptions of the status of devoicing in zeísmo. Results indicate that age is a determining factor in speakers’ perceptions, which can be attributed to the discrepancy in the start of the devoicing in each region. We have also determined that speakers are aware of the sound change that has taken place in their respective capital region of the larger Rio de la Plata region; however, they remain relatively unaware of the status of the change in the opposite capital region.
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Appendix A

Word list

gallo  bella  masa  lado  sano
talle  playa  ceja  nace  dado
olla   llanta  fecha  mapa  larga
llave  sella  lata  vena  selva
llana  vela  lazo  ronda  vaso
yate  beña  beca  taza  hace
ela   leva  nada  bate  rana
joya   cada  mano  lago  pata
llama  mate  raro  toca  besa
malla  sapo  rama  daño  pera
cayo  copa  roca  malo  cama
raya  ropa  manta  toma  pasa
calle  vale  marca  caldo  salva
mayo  papa  caro  venta  dato
calla  tela  tapa  rota  plata
haya  paso  carta  mesa  bota

Appendix B

Survey lists

List 1:  [eʒa]  [caje]  pasa
    vela    beca    lago  [beja]  salva
    baño    nada    toca  [plaja]  dato
    leva    mano    daño  [ʒanta]  plata
    cada   raro    malo  [ʃa]  bota
    [gaʃa]  [joʃa]  toma
    mate    rama    [məʃa]  mesa
    sapo    roca    caldo  [caʃa]
    copa    manta    venta
    [taʃe]    [ʃama]  rota
    ropa    marca    sano
    [ʃa]    [ʃa]    [caʃa]
    vale    tapa    dado
    papa    carta    [ʃaʃa]
    tela    [maʃa]  larga
    [ʃaʃa]    lado    selva
    paso    nace    vaso
    masa    [ʃaʃa]  [ʃaʃa]
    ceja    mapa    hace
    [ʃaʃa]    vena    rana
    fecha  ronda  pata
    lata  taza  besa
    [ʃaʃa]    [ʃaʃa]  pera
    lazo  bate  cama
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List 2:</th>
<th>List 3:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vela</td>
<td>vela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baña</td>
<td>ronda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leva</td>
<td>leva</td>
<td>taza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cada</td>
<td>[raja]</td>
<td>cada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[gaño]</td>
<td>bate</td>
<td>[gaño]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mate</td>
<td>[caño]</td>
<td>mate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapo</td>
<td>lago</td>
<td>sapo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copa</td>
<td>toca</td>
<td>toca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[taño]</td>
<td>daño</td>
<td>[taño]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ropa</td>
<td>malo</td>
<td>ropa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ojo]</td>
<td>toma</td>
<td>[ojo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vale</td>
<td>[majo]</td>
<td>vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papa</td>
<td>caldo</td>
<td>papa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tela</td>
<td>venta</td>
<td>tela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3ave]</td>
<td>rota</td>
<td>[3ave]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paso</td>
<td>mesa</td>
<td>paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masa</td>
<td>[caña]</td>
<td>masa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceja</td>
<td>sano</td>
<td>ceja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Jana]</td>
<td>dado</td>
<td>[Jana]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fecha</td>
<td>larga</td>
<td>fecha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lata</td>
<td>selva</td>
<td>lata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Jate]</td>
<td>vaso</td>
<td>[Jate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lazo</td>
<td>[haja]</td>
<td>lazo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[efa]</td>
<td>hace</td>
<td>[efa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beca</td>
<td>rana</td>
<td>beca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nada</td>
<td>pata</td>
<td>nada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mano</td>
<td>besa</td>
<td>mano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raro</td>
<td>pera</td>
<td>raro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[joja]</td>
<td>cama</td>
<td>[joja]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rama</td>
<td>pasa</td>
<td>rama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roca</td>
<td>[beña]</td>
<td>roca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manta</td>
<td>salva</td>
<td>manta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3ama]</td>
<td>[plaña]</td>
<td>[3ama]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marca</td>
<td>dato</td>
<td>marca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caro</td>
<td>[janta]</td>
<td>caro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapa</td>
<td>plata</td>
<td>tapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carta</td>
<td>[seña]</td>
<td>carta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[maña]</td>
<td>bota</td>
<td>[maña]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lado</td>
<td>nace</td>
<td>lado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nace</td>
<td>[caño]</td>
<td>nace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>