B O R E A L I S
An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics

SOCIOPRAGMATIC VARIATION IN ATTENTION FOCUS: *MIRA*, *FÍJATE*, AND *OYE* IN SAN JUAN AND MEXICO CITY[1]

Lamar A. Graham
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

ABSTRACT. Discourse markers of attention focus (*enfocadores de alteridad* in Spanish) frequently serve the purposes of drawing the hearer's attention to what the speaker is saying, either to establish or maintain contact between the two interlocutors. The current study aims to determine whether the choice of appellative marker is socially or grammatically motivated. Using sociolinguistic corpora from two major Latin American cities, the study will analyze the variation among the markers. More specifically, are there factors that significantly influence whether a speaker elects to use *mira*, *fíjate* or *oye* to focus the attention of the hearer? The study finds that the choice between markers in San Juan and Mexico City is conditioned by different factors in each locale and, additionally, hints that the style of discourse may have an effect on the prevalence of these markers in general.

Keywords: attention focus, discourse markers, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, Spanish, variation

RESUMEN. Loa marcadores de discurso llamados *enfocadores de alteridad* a menudo realizan el propósito de llamar la atención del oyente a lo que dice el hablante, o para establecer o para mantener contacto entre los interlocutores. El estudio presente pretende determinar si la elección del marcador apelativo es motivada social o gramaticalmente. Por medio de usar corpus sociolingüísticos de dos ciudades latinoamericanas principales, se analizará en el estudio la variación entre los marcadores. En específico, ¿hay factores que influyan significativamente en la elección de *mira, fíjate* u *oye* de parte del hablante para llamar la atención del oyente? En el estudio se encuentra que la elección entre marcadores en San Juan y Ciudad de México es acondicionada por factores diferentes en cada lugar y, además, implica que el estilo de discurso puede ejercer cierta influencia en la frecuencia de estos marcadores en general.

Palabras claves. enfoque de alteridad, marcadores del discurso, pragmática, sociolingüística, español/castellano, variación

1. Introduction: uses of attention-focusing discourse markers

In spoken discourse, the function of drawing the attention of the listener is achieved by the speaker through various means; one of these such means is via the use of specialized particles of speech. These particles have been called *attention-focusing*, *appellative*, or *interactive* discourse markers in English and frequently *enfocadores de la alteridad* (lit. 'otherness focalizers') due to their function of bringing the hearer into the same frame or context as the speaker (Landone 2012). These markers fit within the larger set of discourse markers as described by Martín Zorraquino and Portolés (1999) and Portolés (2001) as having the function of meaningfully and purposefully guiding

[1] This paper is an expansion and modification of Graham (2018b).

© Lamar A. Graham. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, 2021, 10 / 1. pp. 87-102. https://doi.org/10.7557/1.10.1.5721

the interaction between speaker and hearer. Attention-focusing discourse markers (alternatively *AFDMs* hereafter) are often uttered by the speaker either to establish contact at the beginning of a conversation or to maintain contact at an intermediate point during the conversation. Whatever the case, the inference behind the marker is that what the speaker is about to share is of high importance (Cestero Mancera 2003) and that it would behoove the hearer to pay close attention.

2. Previous studies involving AFDMs

AFDMs often take the form of lexical verbs conjugated as imperatives; verbs used for the purpose of focusing attention tend to be semantic indicators of perception. The most frequently produced AFDMs in Spanish involve seeing/looking – such as *ver* 'to see', *mirar* 'to look at, to watch', or *fijarse* 'to pay attention (lit. 'to fix oneself')' – and hearing/listening – such as *oír* 'to hear' or *escuchar* 'to listen'. González Melón and Hanegreefs (2010) note that *mirar* and *ver* differ both in agentivity and perspective. *Mirar* draws more attention to, and invokes more agency on the part of, the interlocutor, whereas *ver* is more passive and places the focus on the object instead of the subject. Ocampo (2009) remarks that, in addition to the meaning 'look' or 'pay attention', there is also a meaning of 'consider' encoded in the marker *mira*. The notion of 'considering', though seemingly formal, communicates the importance of what the speaker is about to share, thus further imploring the hearer to focus on the conversation of the interlocutor.[2] Galué (2002) describes *fíjate* as linked to *mira* in use and meaning. One notable difference in *fíjate* that Galué mentions is that the marker is very strongly indicative of previously unknown information that the speaker desires to share thereafter.

In describing their contexts and uses, Briz and Pons Bordería (2010) indicate that AFDMs carry phatic value. That is, they maintain the original function of the imperative as an establishment or reinforcement of the relationship between speaker and listener, hence their appellation of *enfocadores de alteridad*. Depending on where they appear during the turn, they serve different functions. AFDMs at the beginning of a turn – *initiative* contexts – signal a change in topic or direction by the speaker.

(1) G: sí/ peroo-pero son-son cosas distintas/ ee-en Estados Unidos con la tradición que
tienen/ es// mm/ son muy cuidadosos con los asuntos de las libertades individuales/ siempre que no esté/ eeh los intereses de estado [la cia por medio]
V: […]
G: entonces/ naturalmente
S: ***oye*** vamos a jugar/ una partidica
'G: yes/ buut-but they're-they're different things/ um in the United States with the tradition that they have/ it's// mm/ they're very careful with matters of individual liberties/ as long as it's not/ um the interests of the State [the CIA in the middle of it]
V: […]
G: so/ naturally
S: ***hey***/ let's play/ a little game'

[2] Ocampo's study involves *mirá*, the *voseo* imperative of *mirar*; this morphological difference has no bearing on the pragmatics of the marker. It should also be noted that, although the notions of 'look/pay attention' and 'consider' are distinct, they do at times overlap.

(Briz and Val.Es.Co. 2002:169, lines 866-872; in Briz and Pons Bordería 2010[3])

Here we have G describing matters of politics in the United States as different from Spain, when suddenly S interrupts the conversation asking to play a game. Without further context, we do not know why S chose to interrupt the conversation, but it is clear that this speaker had no desire to continue the current discussion. There exists another initiative use of AFDMs, found after leading questions, that signals that what follows is deeply important to the speaker and that s/he implores that the hearer pay close attention:

(2) E: ¿Cómo tú comparas, este, el casco urbano de Bayamón con el casco urbano de Río Piedras?
I: Pues ***fíjate*** Bayamón, este, actualmente han hecho mejoras y están haciendo mejoras en ah, eh, en el casco en y los alrededores.
'E: How do you compare, *este*, Bayamón's urban area to that of Rio Piedras?
I: Well, ***check it out***, Bayamón, *este*, has recently done improvements and it's doing improvements in ah, eh, in the urban district and in the suburbs.'
(PRESEEA San Juan interview 18; Middle-aged man, high-school education)

A third use of AFDMs in initiative contexts is noted by Loureda Lamas (2010), who states that the markers indicate that the speaker is taking his or her turn in the conversation, possibly to interrupt or, as in the following example, after a long pause:

(3) C: ¿eh? / lo que nos apetezca/ tú ya has cenado y todo ¿verdad Pili?/ mañana
tiene que madrugar la tía ¿a qué hora te levantas cariño?
P: a las seis menos cuarto (3")
C: ***fíjate***/ pues ho no he dormido casi/ porque tenía miedo a dormirme// me acosté muy tarde/ y he estao con la radio puesta/ el transistor puesto toda la noche/ y sin-/ y sin
P: dormirte
'C: eh?/ whatever we fancy/ you've already eaten dinner and everything, right, Pili?/ tomorrow you'll have to wake your aunt up… what time do you get up, dear?
P: at a quarter to six (3s)
C: ***look*** well I almost didn't sleep/ because I was scared to fall asleep// I went to bed very late/ and I was up with the radio on/ the transistor [radio] on all night/ and without- / and without
P: falling asleep'
(Loureda Lamas 2010:142, ex. 38)

Speaker C above uses *fijate* to begin her turn after a three-second break in the conversation between herself and her niece P.

Briz and Pons Bordería later describe AFDMs as functioning as intensifiers within a speaker's turn – a *continuative* context – in order to alert the hearer to the importance of the message.

[3] Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are mine.

(4) A: […] te digo también que estos temas son peligrosos cuando estás casada que es mii situación/ porque si intoxicas mucho a la familia puede que te manden fuera o sea … porque tengo amigas que se han separao -
C: ¿sí?
A: - por temas de este tipo…. ¡oye! de mi edad/ quiero decir que no es que tenían veinte años … eh?
'A: […] and I'm telling you that these topics are dangerous when you're married which is my situation/ because if you mislead the family a lot they just may kick you out or … because I have friends who have gotten separated -
C: yeah?
A: - for reasons like this … ***¡oye!*** at my age/ I mean it's not like they were twenty … eh?
(Briz and Val.Es.Co 2002: 364, lines 559-565; in Briz and Pons Bordería 2010)

In the above example, A is discussing how dishonesty with one's family can put one at risk of becoming separated or otherwise excommunicated. Note how A uses *oye* to drive home her point that breakups over dishonesty can happen at any age, not just young adulthood. Thus, it is evident that the meaning or function of an AFDM is position-dependent.

Though primarily found in oral discourse, with the advent of Internet message boards and chats, AFDMs have entered into the written discourse sphere. Pano Alamán (2015) describes the functions of several DMs as they appear in comment sections on Spanish and Argentine news sites. Most of them are used in the exact same way in the comment section as they are in spoken discourse., and *mira* 'look' is no exception:

(5) ***Mire,*** la "Santa Inquisici<ó>n" y el franquismo, le costaron a Espa<ñ>a siglos de retraso. La democracia que hoy se tiene es sagrada. Evitemos que las ideas del social comunismo, pseudo humanisticas nos vuelvan a retrasar. Y me disculpara pues debo retirarme.
'***Look***, the Holy Inquisition and Francoism brought Spain centuries of delay. The democracy which we have today is sacred. Let's keep pseudo-humanistic ideas of social communism from slowing us down again. And you'll have to pardon me, I should be going.'
(Pano Alamán 2015:109, ex. 62)

The speaker here is emphasizing via *mire* that her statement is meant to be closely regarded by her counterpart in the discussion. This analysis is important in that it shows how the style of writing on social media is more closely aligned to oral norms than the written standard. Had this been a face-to-face conversation instead of a virtual one, it is reasonable to assume that uses of *mira* and other AFDMs could be similarly analyzed. Romero Trillo (1997) notes that these properties of AFDMs appear to be common on a crosslinguistic basis, considering the English markers *look* and *listen* compared to the Spanish markers *oye/oiga* 'hear', *mira/mire* 'look', *escucha/escuche* 'listen', and *fíjate/fíjese* 'pay attention'. In his study involving Spanish speakers from Madrid and English speakers from London, he finds that *mira* is the only marker used at a statistically significantly higher rate when compared to each of *fíjate* and oye; there was no significant difference either between *oye* and *fíjate* or among all three markers compared as a set. Additionally, Romero Trillo finds that there is a clear dichotomy

between "listening" and "looking" as attention-focusing markers in English, whereas in Spanish both perceptive concepts appear to share discursive terrain.

3. The current study: aims, methodology, predictions

Following the previous analyses of markers of attention focus, the purpose of the current study is to measure the variation between two specific appellative markers: *mira*/*mire* and *fíjate*/*fíjese*. This study will depart from previous studies in that, instead of comparing relative frequencies between markers, levels of variation and factors impacting said variation are the primary goal. More specifically, what grammatical, pragmatic, and extralinguistic factors lead a speaker to use *mira* over *fíjate* or vice versa?

3.1. Data

The source material for this study was gathered from corpora built by the *Proyecto para el Estudio Sociolingüístico del Español de España y de America* (PRESEEA 2014). The corpora consist of semidirected sociolinguistic interviews between a researcher (or a team of researchers) and a participant from a particular area, of which the PRESEEA collaborative comprises 42 teams from Spain and the Americas. This study makes use of the PRESEEA corpora from San Juan (Puerto Rico) and Mexico City.

Each corpus team categorizes its interviewees according to sex, age, and educational attainment. For sex, the speakers are classified as male or female. The PRESEEA protocol defines three classes of age: generation 1 (18-34 years of age), generation 2 (35-54 years of age), and generation 3 (55+ years of age). Finally, according to the protocol, speakers are classified according to highest educational level: level 1 (primary, or less than high school), level 2 (high school completed), and level 3 (college degree). Table 1 shows the demographic data of all the participants in the analyzed interviews.

Table 1. Demographics of participants

City	**Sex**		**Age**			**Educational level**			**Total**
	Male	Female	Young	Middle	Elder	Primary	HS	College	
Mexico City	54	54	36	36	36	36	36	36	**108**
San Juan	20	21	9	18	14	9	13	19	**41**[4]
Totals	**74**	**75**	**45**	**54**	**50**	**45**	**49**	**55**	**149**

The following subsection describes how each of these characteristics is used as an independent factor in the analysis of variation.

3.2. Methodology: corpus search, coding, variable-rules analysis

In this study, the dependent variable is defined as the speaker's choice of *mira*, *fíjate*, or *oye* as an attention-focusing marker. The demographic characteristics of each speaker are the other independent extralinguistic factors: sex (male, female), age (younger – 1st generation, middle-age – 2nd generation, elder – 3rd generation), and educational attainment (primary education, high school diploma, college degree).

[4] Each corpus was used in its entirety. The reasons as to why the PRESEEA teams for San Juan and Mexico City conducted and published such different numbers of interviews are unknown.

Results are to be divided between the Mexico City and San Jose populations in order to determine if these factors have different effects in each city.

To measure whether linguistic factors play a role in a speaker's production of *mira*, *fíjate* or *oye*, I include two morphosyntactic variables as well: position of the marker within the turn (initial, medial) and form of address of the marker (*tuteo*, *ustedeo*). The position of the marker within the turn reflects the speaker's purpose in using the marker. At the beginning of the turn, a speaker would use an appellative marker to call the attention of the hearer to what he or she is about to say, while within a turn the same marker would be used to maintain the hearer's attention to the speaker. Regarding the form of address, informal and formal contact is marked morphosyntactically in Spanish in three ways: by subject pronoun (informal *tú* versus formal *usted*), in the verbal morphology (2nd-person morphology in informal address, 3rd-person morphology in formal address), and in object pronouns (most apparent in informal *fíjate* and formal *fíjese*).

Table 2, to follow, shows the coding schema as input into GoldVarb X (Sankoff, Tagliamonte, and Smith 2006), the computer program used for running the variable-rules analysis.

Table 2. Coding schema for GoldVARB

Variable and code	**Meaning**
Attention-focus marker (dependent variable)	
m	*mira* (including *mire*)
f	*fíjate* (including *fíjese*)
o	*oye* (including *oiga*)
City	
S	**S**an Juan
X	Me**x**ico City
Age group	
1	younger speakers (18-34)
2	middle-age speakers (35-54)
3	elder speakers (55+)
Educational attainment	
p	primary education (no high school diploma)
s	secondary education (high school diploma)
(d)	up to high school diploma
h	higher education (college)
Sex	
M	male
F	female
Form of address of marker	
t	informal *tuteo* (*mira, fíjate*)
u	formal *ustedeo* (*mire, fíjese*)
Position of marker within turn	
i	turn-initial '***Mira/Fíjate/Oye…*** […]'
m	turn-medial '[…] ***mira/fíjate/oye…*** […]'

Here I note that the corpus from San Juan does not include a cross-section of speakers belonging to the younger generation with less than a high school education, while the Mexico City corpus has speakers of all ages in all education categories. To mitigate any interaction effects from this gap in the population, I collapsed the *p* and *s* levels into one new level, *d*, to test against college-educated speakers marked as *h*.

Because of the multiple uses of each verb, certain productions were not suitable for inclusion in the analysis. Such productions were:

- Verbs clearly used in the present indicative (applicable to *mira* and *oye*) or present subjunctive (applicable to *mire* and *oiga*) and not as imperatives
- Imperatives used as physical commands and not as discourse markers (e.g. *mira las flores aquí* or *oye esa canción*)
- Reduplicated markers (e.g. *mira mira*) were counted as only one instance; however, if a speaker clustered different markers at any point in their utterance (e.g. *oye fíjate*), both were counted individually
- Reported speech, e.g. the participants quoting themselves or other speakers
- Markers produced by either the interviewer or auxiliary participants

These instances were discarded. Thus, each usable token of *mira*, *fíjate*, and *oye* from the corpus interviews was coded according to the above schema.

3.3. Hypotheses: predictions of outcomes

In this study, I analyze data from both San Juan and Mexico City data to determine whether the aforementioned factors of geography, age, sex, education, utterance position, and formality exert any significant influence on whether a speaker uses *mira, fíjate*, or *oye* as an attention-focusing marker. My working hypothesis is that each factor will significantly affect the production of each marker in similar contexts.[5] I also expect that *mira* will be the most frequently produced AFDM in all populations and all contexts, following Romero Trillo's (1997) findings and Galué's (2002) description, regardless of independent factor significance.[6]

4. Results

From the San Juan and Mexico City corpora, a total of 1566 usable tokens were entered into GoldVARB for analysis. Of these, 564 tokens were from the San Juan interviews, while 1002 were from Mexico City. There are no preliminary conclusions to be drawn from these numbers due to the fact that the PRESEEA San Juan corpus contains fewer transcriptions than that of Mexico City.

4.1. Overall results

In Table 3 we see the raw totals of each marker as produced in each city. On the basis of the totals themselves, we see that *mira* is produced more frequently in both locales. However, San Juan speakers produced *mira* at a higher percentage than did Mexico City speakers.

Table 3. Frequencies of outcomes, San Juan and Mexico City

City		***mira***	***fíjate***	***oye***	**Total**
San Juan	N	331	220	13	564
	%	58.7	39.0	2.3	
Mexico City	N	470	437	95	1002
	%	46.9	43.6	9.5	
Total	N	801	657	108	1566
	%	51.1	42	6.9	

[5] Pons and Samaniego (1998) observed differences in marker production based on age and sex based on frequency. While I expect the factors to all significantly influence AFDM production, I make no predictions as to the direction of influence of any of them.

[6] See also Poblete 1998; Toniolo and Zurita 2014; Cabedo Nebot 2013; Bentivoglio, Guirado, and Malaver 2014; Mendoza 2014; and Valencia 2014 for similar findings.

We also note that *oye* as an AFDM was notably less frequently present in the interviews than the other two markers, comprising less than 7 percent of all markers in the study. Because of the relatively low percentages of *oye* in both cities, it is fair to consider this particular marker as not as salient as the others. As a matter of fact, most productions of *oye* from both corpora were categorized as reported speech (211 instances) and not naturally produced by the participants themselves. From this point forward, the quantitative variationist analysis will exclude the 108 instances of *oye*. We will discuss some possible explanations of the low rate of *oye* in Sections 5 and 6.

Table 4 shows the distribution of *mira* and *fíjate* across both cities.

*Table 4. Frequencies of outcomes in total (*oye *excluded)*

City		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
San Juan	N	331	220	551
	%	60.1	39.9	
Mexico City	N	470	437	907
	%	51.8	48.2	
Total	N	801	657	1458
	%	54.9	45.1	

With San Juan *mira* production slightly above 60 percent and that of Mexico City over more than 52 percent, the question remained whether this disparity in percentage was statistically significant. The factor weights in Table 5 provide some perspective.

Table 5. Factor weights for city of speaker

Group	**Factor**	**Weight**
City	San Juan	0.55
	Mexico City	0.47
	Range = 8	
Total Chi-square = 200.4266		
Chi-square/cell = 2.9047		
Log likelihood = -990.309		

In a VARBRUL analysis, factor weights[7] show how strongly a certain factor favors the determined dependent variable application value, which for this study is *mira*. Factor weights above .50 show that the independent factor favors *mira*, while factor weights below .50 show a disfavoring effect of *mira*, which can instead be interpreted as favoring effect of *fíjate*. Very frequently in variationist studies, one factor can be determined as favoring the non-application value despite the associated outcomes occurring at a higher frequency for the application value. So is this the case in this analysis; despite *mira* being the most frequently occurring attention-focus in either city, the factor weights show that *mira* is only slightly favored as a marker in San Juan. Mexico City, on the other hand, is shown to slightly favor *fíjate* as an attention-focus marker. The difference in relative frequencies of each marker is discrepant enough for the VARBRUL analysis to find that the city of origin of the speaker is a significant factor in the choice of *mira* versus *fíjate* in attention-focus contexts. However, because

[7] By convention, the factor weights presented in this paper are accurate to two digits. GoldVarb returns factor weights accurate to three digits, and so some rounding error is present in all the factor weights presented herein.

the range between factor levels is only 8 – clearly a relatively small range – the effect of city of origin on marker choice is not considered particularly strong in this study.

As this first phase of the study was intended to compare attention-focus marker usage between two cities, comparing overall factor weights for age, sex, education, form of address, and placement within turn are unimportant at this juncture. These outcomes become much more relevant within each speech community. Now that the data analysis has shown that the choice between *mira* and *fíjate* is significantly affected by geography, let us now turn our attention to the remaining factors under study and what role they play within each community.

4.2. San Juan

Sanjuanero speakers produced 551 instances of either *mira* or *fíjate* (13.4 tokens/interview) as attention-focus markers in the corpus, of which 331 were *mira* (8.1 tokens/interview) against 220 of *fíjate* (5.4 tokens/interview). Table 6 displays the absolute and relative frequencies of each outcome according to factor.

Table 6. Frequencies of outcomes, San Juan

Age		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Younger generation	N	74	48	122
	%	60.7	39.3	
Middle-age generation	N	140	126	266
	%	52.6	47.4	
Elder generation	N	117	46	163
	%	71.8	28.2	
Educational attainment		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
High school or less	N	228	180	408
	%	55.9	44.1	
College	N	103	40	143
	%	72.0	28.0	
Sex		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Male	N	147	114	261
	%	56.3	43.7	
Female	N	184	106	290
	%	63.4	36.6	
Form of address		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Informal (*tú*)	N	295	217	512
	%	57.6	42.4	
Formal (*usted*)	N	36	3	39
	%	92.3	7.7	
Position within turn		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Turn-internal	N	257	133	390
	%	65.9	34.1	
Turn-initial	N	74	87	161
	%	46.0	54.0	
Total	**N**	**331**	**220**	**551**
	%	**60.1**	**39.9**	

Overall, the Sanjuanero group produced *mira* as an attention focus marker 60.1% of the time (331 of 551 tokens). In addition to the overall percentage, *mira* was the most frequent AFDM in all contexts except one: turn-initial position within the speaker's turn (54% *fíjate*).

The factor weights in Table 7 show the tendencies toward *mira* or *fíjate* based on each factor level.

Table 7. Factor weights, San Juan

Group	Factor	Weight
Form of address	Formal (*usted*)	0.87
	Informal (*tú*)	0.46
	Range = 41	
Educational attainment	College	0.66
	High school or less	0.44
	Range = 22	
Position within turn	Turn-internal	0.55
	Turn-initial	0.37
	Range = 18	
Sex	*Female*	*[0.54]*
	Male	*[0.45]*
Age	*Elder generation*	*[0.57]*
	Younger generation	*[0.48]*
	Middle generation	*[0.46]*

Total Chi-square = 70.4926
Chi-square/cell = 2.3498
Log likelihood = -339.133

According to the variable-rules analysis, three of the five factors were determined to be statistically significant. The analysis of form of address – informal versus formal – as a factor showed that while informal contexts only slightly favored *fíjate* over *mira*, formal address showed a very strong tendency toward *mire*. Regarding position of the marker within the turn, continuative contexts (turn-internal position) showed a slight tendency toward *mira*, while initiative contexts (turn-initial position) showed a strong favoring effect toward *fíjate* as indicated by the frequency table. College-educated speakers preferred *mira*, whereas those whose education did not continue past high school tended slightly toward *fíjate*.

Women tended to slightly favor *mira*, while men tended to slightly favor *fíjate*. Finally, elder speakers showed a slight preference toward *mira* while middle-aged and younger speakers showed an even slighter preference toward *fíjate*. The speaker's sex and age, shown in italics in Table 7, were not determined by the variable rules analysis to be statistically significant factors in this part of the study.

4.3. Mexico City

Capitalino speakers produced 907 instances of the AFDMs under study (8.4 tokens/interview), of which 470 were *mira* (4.4 tokens/interview) and 437 were *fíjate* (4.0 tokens/interview). Table 8 shows the percentages of the production of each marker in all factor groups.

Table 8. Frequencies of outcomes, Mexico City

Age		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Younger generation	N	128	127	255
	%	50.2	49.8	
Middle-age generation	N	196	171	367
	%	53.4	46.6	
Elder generation	N	146	139	285
	%	51.2	48.8	
Educational attainment		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
High school or less	N	334	310	644
	%	52.9	47.1	
College	N	136	127	263
	%	51.7	48.3	
Sex		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Male	N	232	167	399
	%	58.1	41.9	
Female	N	238	270	508
	%	46.9	53.1	
Form of address		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Informal (*tú*)	N	431	395	826
	%	52.2	47.8	
Formal (*usted*)	N	39	42	81
	%	48.1	51.9	
Position w*ithin turn*		***mira***	***fíjate***	**Total**
Turn-internal	N	304	297	601
	%	50.6	49.4	
Turn-initial	N	166	140	306
	%	54.2	45.8	
Total	**N**	**470**	**437**	**907**
	%	**51.8**	**48.2**	

Speakers from Mexico City produced *mira* more frequently than *fíjate* at a very slight ratio of 52:48, and this was fairly consistent across all factors with the notable exception of sex which will be discussed later.

The factor weights for the Capitalino population in Table 9 show which factors favor *mira* and which favor *fíjate*.

Table 9. Factor weights, Mexico City

Group	Factor	Weight
Sex	Male	0.57
	Female	0.45
	Range = 12	
Position within turn	*Turn-internal*	*[0.51]*
	Turn-initial	*[0.49]*
Educational attainment	*High school or less*	*[0.50]*
	College	*[0.50]*
Age	*Middle-age generation*	*[0.52]*
	Elder generation	*[0.50]*
	Younger generation	*[0.47]*
Form of address	*Informal (*tú*)*	*[0.50]*
	*Formal (*usted*)*	*[0.46]*

Total Chi-square = 80.9622
Chi-square/cell = 2.0760
Log likelihood = -621.188

In this population, only one of the five factors was determined to be statistically significant. Sex was the strongest factor here (range = 12), with men slightly preferring *mira* and women slightly preferring *fíjate*. As the range between factor weights for each of the following factors was very small (in the case of education, essentially zero due to roundoff error), position within turn, educational attainment, age, and form of address were not calculated to be statistically significant factors.

5. Discussion

In comparing the two cities' production of AFDMs, it is notable that as the San Juan corpus returned a higher frequency of markers overall than did that of Mexico City in terms of markers per interview, this difference in frequency between *mira* and *fíjate* was accordingly determined to be only slightly significant. Having recalled this, it is important to recall that the relative frequencies of each marker were different, indicating that these differences may be socially and/or linguistically conditioned in each area. One of the few similarities in variation between *mira/fíjate* in the two cities is that age was not determined to be significant in conditioning whether a speaker uses either marker. This suggests that, unlike the conclusions reached in Graham (2018a), a speaker's choice of AFDM cannot predict or indicate whether a speaker belongs to the younger, middle-age, or elder generation. Neither can the converse be conclusively true; the use of a particular AFDM cannot be considered an innovation or a newer development in either speech community.

5.1. Social variation

The San Juan and Mexico City populations hold no factors in common regarding significance effects on AFDM preference, with the exception of age (though it was found to be insignificant across the entire study). While Sanjuanero speakers with college degrees preferred *mira* over *fíjate*, Capitalino speakers showed no appreciable difference based on educational attainment. In the San Juan community, this may indicate underlying associations or attitudes between educational attainment and the

markers a speaker chooses. Use of the marker *fíjate* in San Juan may be stigmatized as a characteristic or indicator of a less-educated speaker, whereas in Mexico City this stigma may not exist.

Sex as a factor in AFDM production was significant in Mexico City but not in San Juan. Like education as a factor, as addressed in the previous subsection, the differences in AFDM production according to sex were not identical. In Mexico City, the use of *fíjate* was more closely aligned to women (and *mira* to men), while the opposite was true of the San Juan group. Accordingly, *fíjate* might be a pattern aligned with female speech and not so much with that of men in Mexico City, while conversely *fíjate* may be more closely associated with male speech patterns in San Juan than those of female speakers. Looking at the ranges in factor weights between male and female speakers in each city (r = 12 in Mexico City, r = 9 in San Juan while not significant), this association is not believed to be a strong one.

5.2. Morphological variation: form of address

Analysis of the San Juan population returned a strong favoring effect toward *mire* and away from *fíjese*. This tendency could be explained from two points of view. From a morphological perspective, familiar forms are more prevalently produced in Spanish overall. This is not only true of verbs but also any associated clitic pronouns; familiar *te* serves the purposes of being an accusative, dative, and reflexive pronoun, whereas in formal address the speaker must choose between accusative *lo*, dative *le*, or reflexive *se*. In the case of *mira* and *fíjate*, a speaker encodes informality in one morpheme – the verbal reflex – with *mira*, while with *fíjate* the speaker must encode agreement between the verbal reflex and the associated reflexive pronoun. Thus, we see a higher grade of morphological complexity in {fíj-}+{-a}$_1$+{-te}$_2$ than in {mir-}+{a}$_1$. This idea of morphological complexity carries over to formal commands. As *fíjate* is already more marked than *mira* due to two present agreement morphemes, the markedness increases due to changing agreement in two morphemes in {fíj-}+{-e}$_1$+{-se}$_2$ as opposed to only one in {mir-}+{-e}$_1$.

From a sociolinguistic or sociopragmatic perspective, there is a difference in urgency between *mira* and *fíjate*. Speakers tend to use *fíjate/fíjese* in contexts during which they require the hearer to pay a greater amount of attention or to do so more quickly.[8] Because of this difference in urgency, it might cause Sanjuanero speakers to be reluctant to say *fíjese* to a hearer with whom more formal address is required or expected, possibly because such a direct attention grab may be perceived as unacceptably impolite.

Reflecting the differences between the two speaker populations, we see that formality of address is insignificant as a factor in Mexico City as returned by the VARBRUL calculations. This may imply that, in contrast to San Juan, the effects of morphological complexity and politeness do not negatively affect use of *fíjarse* as a command, and the close raw percentages in informal and formal contexts bear this out.

5.3. Syntactic-pragmatic variation: position within turn

In San Juan, initiative contexts showed a favoring effect toward *fíjate* instead of *mira*, while the opposite was true of continuative contexts. The marker *fíjate*, being a more urgent AFDM than *mira* as discussed in the previous subsection, seems to be better suited for initiating a turn. The importance of this is that establishing one's turn

[8] Acknowledgments are in order to two anonymous informants for their intuitions regarding differences in urgency between *mira* and *fíjate*.

in a dialogue may require a stronger measure of illocutionary force than maintaining a turn that one already has; to that end, *fíjate* would provide the force that *mira* lacks. Conversely, the inherent illocutionary force of *fíjate* may be stronger than necessary to maintain one's turn; *mira* would be more pragmatically appropriate in this case, though both are possible. These observations are more pronounced in San Juan than in Mexico City.

5.4. Possible explanations for the lack of oye *production*[9]

The marker *oye*, more associated with "listening" than "looking" per Romero Trillo (1997), appears to be less pragmatically suited to the type of discourse investigated in this study. However, there may be another justification for the lack of *oye* production. It is entirely possible that the style of discourse – an open-ended interview in all cases – affected its rate of use. While *mira* and *fíjate* were produced freely among all populations, *oye* was so relatively infrequent that there could be nothing significantly gained from its quantitative analysis vis-à-vis the former two markers. This seems to follow an observation by Romero Trillo (1997) that visual attention focus (*mira*, *fíjate*) is usually more pragmatically appropriate than auditory attention focus (*oye*) in conversational discourse such as this. Furthermore, the style of discourse may have affected the prominence of *oye* in the conversation. Romero Trillo compared the proportions of all the markers in both guided interviews and spontaneous conversation with no interviewer involvement, and in his study *oye* (and, in fact, all the markers) was considerably more frequently produced with no interviewer present (1997: 216, 218-219). This clearly implies that there was a sociopragmatic filter blocking AFDM production in the interview section of his corpus that was not present in the spontaneous recordings, and I suspect that this same filter negatively affected the prominence of *oye* in the PRESEEA corpora which consist of nothing but guided interviews.

6. Conclusions and directions for future analyses

We have seen in this study how attention-focusing discourse marker use in certain populations can be stratified socially and/or grammatically. Primarily, we have found that, though the markers share common functions and contexts, a speaker in Mexico City is slightly more likely to use *fíjate* than one from San Juan. Though the effects of certain factors on AFDM production are small in the populations of San Juan and Mexico City, they are salient enough to be significant. On an overall scale, we see that the effects of these factors are stronger in San Juan than in Mexico City, suggesting that the *mira* and *fíjate* are more freely variable in the latter city than in the former. Finally, *oye* was found to be too infrequently produced within both corpora to have any appreciable statistical effect on the analysis, and again it is suspected that the style of discourse studied served as an impediment to AFDM production overall but especially to markers such as *oye*.

Future studies along this research line would involve either the inclusion of different independent factors or the analysis of different populations wherein more than one AFDM is regularly encountered in speech. Regarding the unexpected complication discussed earlier that I suspect limited *oye* production, another possible future study would involve a comparison of AFDM production in guided interviews versus open conversations. The unguided discourse style may shed a brighter light on attention-focusing markers as opposed to the filtered, somewhat formal interview style. A final

[9] Acknowledgments are in order to an anonymous reviewer for their suggestion as to why *oye* was excluded from the bulk of the quantitative portion of the study.

study would focus more closely on the pragmatic variation between the markers studied here and less on the social influences.

Lamar A. Graham
Department of Romance Studies
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
323 Dey Hall, CB 3170
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3170
lagraham@email.unc.edu
+1 919-962-7111

References

Bentivoglio, P., Guirado, K., & Malaver, I. (2014). Marcadores del discurso de Caracas. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 5, pp. 43-68.

Briz, A. & Pons Bordería, S. (2010). Unidades, marcadores discursivos y posición, in Ó. Loureda Lamas & E. Acín (eds.), *Los estudios sobre marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*. Madrid: Arco Libros, pp. 327-358.

Cabedo Nebot, A. (2013). Sobre prosodia, marcadores del discurso y unidades del discurso en español: evidencias de un corpus espontáneo. *Onomazeín* 28, pp.201-213. https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.28.22

Cestero Mancera, A. Mª. (2003). El funcionamiento de los recursos lingüísticos de llamada de atención al interlocutor en la conversación y en el discurso académico. *Pragmalingüística* 10-11, pp. 51-94. https://doi.org/10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2002.i10.04

Galué, D. (2002). Marcadores conversacionales: un análisis pragmático. *Boletín de Lingüística (Universidad Central de Venezuela)* 18, pp. 27-48.

González Melón, E. & Hanegreefs, H. (2010). Efectos discursivos de los marcadores *mira* y *a ver* en contextos argumentativos orales: divergencia vs. convergencia comunicativa. In P. Cano López et al. (eds.), *Actas del XXXIX simposio internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística (on cd-rom). Simposio de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, España, 1-4 de febrero de 2010*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, pp. 1-12.

Graham, L. A. (2018a). Variation in hesitation: the case of *este* vs. *eh* in Latin American Spanish. *Spanish in Context* 15:1, pp. 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.00001.gra

Graham, L. A. (2018b). Variation and attention focus: *mira* vs. *fíjate* in San Juan and Mexico City. Presentation, The XXI Annual Ohio State University Congress on Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics (OSUCHiLL XXI/2018), The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. 30-31 Mar 2018.

Landone, E. (2012). El alcance interpersonal de los marcadores del discurso en la dinámica conversacional: el ejemplo de la cortesía verbal. *VERBA* 39, pp. 301-313.

Loureda Lamas, Ó. (2010). Nuevas perspectivas para el análisis del texto: introducción a una lingüística del texto integral. *Revista de Investigación Lingüística* 13, pp. 127-154.

Martín Zorraquino, Mª A. & Portolés (Lázaro), J. (1999). Los marcadores del discurso. In I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 4051-4213.

Mendoza, J. G. (2014). Marcadores discursivos en La Paz. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 5, pp.140-162.

Ocampo, F. (2009). *Mirá*: from verb to discourse particle in Rioplatense Spanish. In J. Collentine et al. (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 254-267.

Pano Alamán, A. (2015). Aproximación a los marcadores del discurso en los comentarios de la prensa digital española y argentina. *Revista del Instituto de Investigaciones Lingüísticas y Literarias Hispanoamericanas (RILL)* 20, pp. 89-114.

Poblete, Mª T. (1998). Los marcadores discursivo-conversacionales de más alta frecuencia en el español de Valdivia (Chile). *Estudios Filológicos* 33, pp. 93-103. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0071-17131998003300007

Pons, H. & Samaniego, J. L. (1998). Marcadores pragmáticos de apoyo discursivo en el habla culta de Santiago de Chile. *Onomazeín* 3, pp. 11-25.

Portolés, J. (2001). *Marcadores de discurso*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Romero Trillo, J. (1997). Your attention, please: pragmatic mechanisms to obtain the addressee's attention in English and Spanish conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28, pp. 205-221. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00083-5

Toniolo, Mª T. & Zurita, Mª E. (2014). Marcadores del discurso en la oralidad culta de Córdoba, Argentina. Recuento contrastivo con el uso peninsular. In D. da Hora, J. Lopes Ribeiro Pedrosa, & R. Marques de Lucena (Org.), *Actas del XVII Congreso Internacional de la ALFAL.* Paraíba, Brazil: ALFAL, pp. 3334-3352.

Valencia, A. (2014). Marcadores del discurso de Santiago de Chile. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 5., pp. 246-276.

Linguistic data and tools cited

Briz, A. & Grupo Val.Es.Co. 2002. *Corpus de conversaciones coloquiales*. Madrid: Arco Libros.

Ortiz López, L. A. (coord.). (2001-). PRESEEA: Corpus lingüístico de Puerto Rico. Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico: Universidad de Puerto Rico. Available at https://preseeapuertorico.wordpress.com. Accessed: 10-2017.

Martín Butragueño, P. and Lastra, Y. (coords.). (2011-2015). *Corpus sociolingüístico de la Ciudad de México* (CSCM). México: El Colegio de México. Available at http://lef.colmex.mx/index.php/investigaciones/corpus-sociolingueistico-de-la-ciudad-de-mexico-cscm. Accessed: 2015-2016.

Moreno Fernández, F. (coord.). (2014-). Corpus del Proyecto para el estudio sociolingüístico del español de España y de América (PRESEEA). Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá. Available at http://preseea.linguas.net. Accessed: 2012-2017.

Sankoff, D., Tagliamonte, S. A., and Smith, E. (2005). Goldvarb X: A variable rule application for Macintosh and Windows. Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.