Definitions and Critical Literature Review of Language Attitude, Language Choice and Language Shift: Samples of Language Attitude Surveys

Serafín M. Coronel-Molina

Indiana University, Bloomington
scoronel@indiana.edu

Introduction

The purpose of the present work is fourfold: (1) to offer a range of definitions of three broad concepts of interest to many sociolinguists and other social scientists: language attitude, language choice and language shift; (2) to present a critical review of these definitions and the literature on language attitude surveys; (3) provide selected online resources related to these topics; and (4) to elaborate a language attitude survey designed to measure the attitudes of Hispanic immigrants in the US towards Spanish, towards English, and towards their own bilingualism. This survey can be easily adapted to any other speech community as well.

In researching the three macroconcepts of language attitude, language choice and language shift, the major problem I encountered is that many prominent researchers in the field clearly are writing for a specialized audience whom they assume already understands the concepts. For this reason, they have not included specific definitions in their works, and instead jump right into the main point of their arguments. In general, I tried to include discussions that in some way offered a definition of the terms. In some cases, the "main point" information the authors discuss can apply to this project in the sense of giving more detail to general definitions of "attitude," "choice" and "shift", and I have included such pieces that add to the picture of the concepts in this regard.

The basic format for the following definition sections is an alphabetical list of authors, with direct quotations (most of them condensed, including only the most essential information, and excluding things like specific examples or case studies) from their texts about language attitude, choice and shift, although I have occasionally paraphrased. At the end of each section, I provide a brief summary of the main similarities and differences among the various definitions. I decided to use this format because I thought it would ultimately be the most useful. This way, the original text is there to fall back on to know exactly what each author said and to quote them directly if desired, or to be interpreted according to the needs of a given project. Thus, this document can serve a variety of purposes, rather than contributing to only a single project.

The critical review of the literature is more of an essay than are the definitions. In this section, I briefly discuss the various readings I encountered, outlining the principal methods and findings of the authors and critiquing them according to their usefulness for the current project. The final section is a language attitude survey designed to be administered to participants from various social strata and educational backgrounds.

Definitions of Language Attitude

Appel and Muysken 1987 (p. 16): "Generally, two theoretical approaches are distinguished to the study of language attitudes. The first one is the *behaviourist* view, according to which attitudes must be studied by observing the responses to certain languages, i.e. their use in actual interactions. The *mentalist* view considers attitudes as an internal, mental state, which may give rise to certain forms of behaviour. It can be described as 'an intervening variable between a stimulus affecting a person and that person's response' (Fasold, 1984: 147)."

Baker 1996 (pp. 41-42): outlines a typology of attitudes to the language environment, although he does not actually define "attitude". "Williams (1991a) sums up differing 'environmental' attitudes to the survival and spread of minority languages. First, the **evolutionist** will tend to follow Darwin's idea of the survival of the fittest. Those languages that are strong will survive. The weaker languages will either have to adapt themselves to their environment, or die.

However, survival of the fittest is too simplistic a view of evolution. It only accents the negative side of evolution: killing, exploitation and suppression. A more positive view is **interdependence** rather than constant competition. Cooperation for mutually beneficial outcomes can be as possible as exploitation (Williams, 1991a)....

The second approach to languages is that of **conservationists** (Williams, 1991a). Conservationists will argue for the maintenance of variety in the language garden [i.e., they believe that minority languages must be protected and preserved somehow]....

The third attitude to languages is that of **preservationists** (Williams, 1991a). Preservationists are different from conservationists by being more conservative and seeking to maintain the status quo rather than develop the language. Preservationists are concerned that any change, not just language change, will damage the chances of survival of their language. Such a group are therefore traditionalists, anti-modern in outlook. Whereas conservationists may think global and act local, preservationists will tend to think local and act local."

Bradac 1990 (p. 387): "[P]ersons have attitudes toward language which are especially salient and influential in initial interactions. This means that various linguistic features trigger in message recipients beliefs ('Her way of talking leads me to think she is a professor') and evaluations ('She is intelligent') regarding message senders, and that these beliefs and evaluations are most likely to affect recipients' behaviours toward senders in contexts of low mutual familiarity."

Crystal 1997 (p. 215): "The feelings people have about their own language or the languages of others."

Davies 1995 (p. 23): "Attitudes are generally assumed to contribute towards an explanation of patterns of linguistic variation, for example, '[…] linguistic attitudes and stereotypes can be a powerful force in influencing linguistic behaviour and, ultimately, linguistic forms themselves' [Trudgill, Labov and Fasold 1979, p. viii-ix]. One has to bear in mind of course that speakers are quite capable of saying one thing and doing another; nevertheless,

it is clear that language attitudes are worthy of study because they form part of the communicative competence of the members of the speech community."

Edwards 1994 (pp. 6-7): "It is not surprising that most linguistic preferences – based upon historical pedigree, aesthetic judgement, 'logic' or whatever – reveal a liking for one's own variety.… The most important attitudes, prejudices and preferences about language and language choice are enshrined in law or sanctioned practice, for these are the codified wishes of the socially dominant.… Many of the difficulties encountered by minority-language communities in particular emerge because local desires do not mesh with state policy."

(pp. 97-98): "The concept of attitude, a cornerstone of traditional social psychology, is not one about which there has been universal agreement. At a general level, however, attitude is a disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects. This disposition is often taken to comprise three components: feelings (affective element), thoughts (cognitive element) and, following upon these, predispositions to act in a certain way (behavioural element). That is, one knows or believes something, has some emotional reaction to it and, therefore, may be assumed to act on this basis. Two points may be made here. The first is that there often exists inconsistency between assessed attitudes and actions presumably related to them.… The second point is that there is sometimes confusion between belief and attitude; this is particularly so in the domain of language attitudes, and often shows up clearly on questionnaires and interviews designed to tap them. *Attitude* includes *belief* as one of its components (as just noted). Thus, a mother's response to the query, 'Is a knowledge of French important for your children, yes or no?' indicates a belief. To gauge *attitude* one would require further probing into the respondent's *feeling* about her expressed belief: for example, she might believe that French is important for her children's career success; yet, she may loathe the language. Thus, many 'attitude' questionnaires are, in fact, 'belief' questionnaires."

Fasold 1987 (pp. 147-148): "The study of attitudes in general begins with a decision between two competing theories about the nature of attitudes. Most language-attitude work is based on a *mentalist* view of attitude as a state of readiness; an intervening variable between a stimulus affecting a person and that person's response (Agheyisi and Fishman 1970: 138, Cooper and Fishman 1974: 7). A person's attitude, in this view, prepares her to react to a given stimulus in one way rather than in another. A typical mentalist definition of attitude is given by Williams (1974: 21): 'Attitude is considered as an internal state aroused by stimulation of some type and which may mediate the organism's subsequent response.' This view poses problems for experimental method, because if an attitude is an internal state of readiness, rather than an observable response, we must depend on the person's reports of what their attitudes are, or infer attitudes indirectly from behavior patterns.…

The other view of attitudes is the *behaviorist* view. On this theory, attitudes are to be found simply in the responses people make to social situations. This viewpoint makes research easier to undertake, since it requires no self-reports or indirect inferences.… Attitudes of this sort, however, would not be quite as interesting as they would be if they were defined mentalistically, because they cannot be used to predict other behavior.…

…Generally speaking, social psychologists who accept the behaviorist definition view attitudes as single units. Mentalists usually consider attitudes to have subparts, such as *cognitive* (knowledge), *affective* (feeling), and *conative* (action) components….

…Language attitudes are distinguished from other attitudes by the fact that they are precisely about language. Some language-attitude studies are strictly limited to attitudes towards language itself.… Most often, however, the definition of language attitude is broadened to include attitudes towards speakers of a particular language or dialect. An even further broadening of the definition allows all sorts of behavior concerning language to be treated, including attitudes toward language maintenance and planning efforts."

Ferguson 1996 (pp. 274-275): "In many ways the effectiveness of language policies in education is determined more by the attitudes of the people on language use than it is by the simple demographic facts of language distribution and use. Discovering language attitudes is more difficult than finding the basic data and also may raise political issues which threaten the successful carrying out of a language survey, but it is of fundamental importance.

What do the speakers of a language believe or feel about its esthetic, religious, and 'logical' values? About the appropriateness of its use for literature, education, and 'national' purposes?

What do the speakers of a language believe or feel about other languages in the country? Are they better or inferior to their own language in general or for specific purposes?"

Jaspaert & Kroon 1988 (p. 158): "… the common core of definitions of the attitude concept [is] the interpretation of attitude as a mental construct offering an explanation for consistency in behaviour (Knops 1983, Edwards 1983, Gardner 1985)."

(p. 157): J&K explicitly link attitudes with language shift and language choice, discussing possible social theories to explain certain contradictory outcomes: "… social factors have an ambiguous influence on language shift processes: in some instances a factor seems to influence language shift in one direction, whereas in another situation that same factor exerts an influence in the opposite direction (Fishman 1972a). As Fishman (1972a) points out, this ambivalence can only be lifted by introducing a theory of social influence on language shift which accounts for the occurrence and the direction of patterns of influence on language shift in relation to the social and linguistic situation in which the process is studied…. In such a theory, attitudes, or concepts related to attitudes, may occupy a prominent place. It should be noted, however, that in most cases attitudes are introduced in linguistic research as fairly isolated concepts, not clearly related to any theory for the explanation of behavior…."

Knops & van Hout 1988 (pp. 1-2): "According to Cooper and Fishman (1974), two approaches to the definition of language attitudes are available. The first approach consists of defining the concept in terms of its referent, thereby stressing the independency of the concept as a phenomenon in its own right. In this approach language attitudes are attitudes towards languages, language varieties, language variants and language behaviour. The second approach is to define language attitudes in terms of their effects or consequences, i.e., those attitudes which influence language behaviour and behaviour towards language. The main argument in favour of this second approach is that any attitude influencing language

behaviour or behaviour towards language is worthwhile to study in sociolinguistics. The problem however is that this definition seems too broad, since almost any attitude under the right conditions might affect language behaviour or behaviour towards language.… With the first definition, the latter distinction is possible, but this definition has the disadvantage of being too narrow; it excludes attitudes of interest to sociolinguists, e.g., attitudes towards organized efforts involved in language planning, attitudes towards the functions allocated to language, and - most importantly - attitudes towards the speakers of a language. Therefore a broad definition of language attitudes is usually adopted, and only when necessary, the distinction between this broad category of attitudes and language attitudes in the strict or narrow sense of the word is made."

(p. 9): "The question as to the causes of variation in language attitudes may be looked at in different ways. One may look at stimulus effects, subject effects and situational effects. Stimulus effects relate to the linguistic determinants of language attitudes. Subject effects relate to the social characteristics of the immediate situation or to characteristics of the broader socio-cultural environment in which language attitudes develop. Finally, factors accounting for changes in language attitudes may be examined."

Massey 1986 (p. 608): prefers Kahn and Weiss's (1973) perspective of attitude: "Despite the many ways in which attitudes are defined, the communality among the various definitions is illustrated by noting that attitudes are selectively acquired and integrated through learning and experience; that they are enduring dispositions indicating response consistency; and that positive or negative affect toward a social or psychological object represents the salient characteristic of an attitude (p. 761)"; and thus adopts Lett's (1977) definition for his study: " 'the amount of positive or negative affect that one holds toward a specific social object or class of social objects.' … Attitude so defined is an abstraction which cannot be measured directly but must be inferred from stated beliefs or exhibited behaviours."

McGroarty 1996 (p. 5): bases her definition on the work of Gardner, in the context of second language acquisition in school settings. "In this frame of reference, *attitude* has cognitive, affective, and conative components (i.e., it involves beliefs, emotional reactions, and behavioral tendencies related to the object of the attitude) and consists, in broad terms, of an underlying psychological predisposition to act or evaluate behavior in a certain way (Gardner, 1985). Attitude is thus linked to a person's values and beliefs and promotes or discourages the choices made in all realms of activity, whether academic or informal."

Münstermann & van Hout 1988 (pp. 174-175): "The older social-psychological definitions of the concept of attitude suggest, often explicitly, a fairly direct relationship between attitude and behaviour.… [e.g., Allport 1935:] 'a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a direct or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.' This definition implies that an attitude is a hypothetical, latent construct which has explanatory value for differences in reaction of individuals and groups towards the same object or situation. Differences in reaction go back to differences in attitude, whereas differences in attitudes are brought about by differences in experiences or information regarding an object or situation. Arguing along these lines one can see three components emerge: a cognitive (information) component, an evaluative or affective component and a conative or behavioural component, and between

these three components a strong connection is assumed to exist. However, it is precisely these relationships between the components which are continuously disputed in social psychology.…

… The conclusion must be that attitudes should be studied in relationship with other predictors of behaviour and with processes intermediating between attitude and behaviour and not in isolation."

Omdal 1995 (p. 85): "Language attitudes are … found to be 'relevant to the definition of speech communities, to the explanation of linguistic change, language maintenance and language shift, and to applied concerns in the fields of intergroup communication, language planning and education (Knops and van Hout 1988: 1)."

(p. 86): "The concept of attitude is widespread both in social psychology and other scientific fields and among lay people. However, there is no general agreement on the definition of *attitude*, not even in social psychology.… Social psychologists often operate with three attitude components: one cognitive, one evaluative, and one reactional or conative …: before a person can react consistently to an object, he or she must know something about it and is then able to evaluate the object positively or negatively; this knowledge and these feelings are usually accompanied by behavioral intentions. Within the definition of language attitudes, it is also quite common to include attitudes towards language users, and not only attitudes toward language and language use.… Furthermore, one has to consider both 'overt' and 'covert' language attitudes."

Richards et al. 1992 (p. 199): "The attitudes which speakers of different languages or language varieties have towards each other's languages or to their own language. Expressions of positive or negative feelings towards a language may reflect impressions of linguistic difficulty or simplicity, ease or difficulty of learning, degree of importance, elegance, social status, etc. Attitudes towards a language may also show what people feel about the speakers of that language.

Language attitudes have an effect on second language or foreign language learning. The measurement of language attitudes provides information which is useful in language teaching and language planning."

Romaine 1995: she does not offer a definition per se, but does give many details which are pertinent to understanding attitudes. The closest she comes to a definition is the following, which is more nearly related to attitude assessment than attitude per se: "Attitude is a more general concept than can be accurately determined from the answer to a specific question or from the responses given by an informant in a carefully controlled experimental situation. The translation of the notion of 'attitude' from the subjective domain into something objectively measurable and therefore more easily comparable is a common problem in any research that involves social categorization and perceptual judgments" (p. 288). She also has quite an extended discussion of language attitude surveys. Throughout her book, Romaine stresses that attitudes towards one language or another, towards bilingualism and towards code-switching generally will all affect an individual's language choice in a given situation, and a community's propensity (or not) for language shift.

(pp. 43-44): instrumental vs. integrative orientations in language attitude: instrumental is defined as "motivated by factors such as the utility of the language"[1]; while integrative is learning/using a language to be able to "interact with speakers of that language and share in their culture," i.e., for solidarity reasons.

(chapter 7): discusses two aspects of attitudes towards bilingualism: "the attitudes of bilinguals towards aspects of bilingual behavior, such as code-switching, and the status it is assigned in the community repertoire. Secondly, there is the question of the attitudes of monolinguals to bilinguals and to various aspects of bilingualism, such as bilingual education…."

(pp. 314-315): "Attitudes do not necessarily remain constant over time." Also, it is possible for bilinguals to have ambivalent attitudes towards their own bilingualism, which can also confound investigations. "In certain contexts where bilingualism is not valued by society at large, bilinguals may experience difficulty in defining their identity. For immigrants, in particular, the feeling of not belonging entirely to either of the cultures whose language they speak, may be disturbing."

(p. 317): It is very important not to confuse attitude with behavior. A person may claim to have a certain attitude about something, but behave in a manner inconsistent with the claimed attitude or belief. "Most public opinion polls actually show a gap between what people claim they support in principle and what they are actually prepared to do."

Sadanand 1993 (p. 123): "Despite acute differences in the definition of attitude and attitude structure of behaviourists and mentalists, there seems to be a consensus on some aspects of attitudes. For example, everyone agrees that attitudes are learned from previous experience and that they are not momentary but relatively 'enduring'…. Many theorists also agree that attitudes bear some positive relation to action or behaviour either as being 'predisposition to behaviour' or as being a special aspect of behaviour itself."

(p. 124): "Attitudes towards the use of different languages are motivated by people's perception of the role of each language and the functions it performs in relation to each other language."

Saville-Troike 1989 (p. 181): talks about language attitude from the ethnographer's perspective, outlining areas of interest such as "questions of how culture-specific criteria for 'speaking well' function in the definition of marking social roles, how attitudes toward different languages and varieties of language reflect perceptions of people in different social categories, and how such perceptions influence interaction within and across the boundaries of a speech community. In addition to their value in adding to our understanding of functions and patterns of language use, answers to such questions are relevant to the explanation of language maintenance and shift…." Characterizes three types of language attitude studies: "(1) those which explore general attitudes toward language and language skills (e.g., which languages or varieties are better than others, to what extent literacy is valued, etc.); (2) those which explore stereotyped impressions toward language, their

---

[1] Romaine offers the example of the Irish learning English, "where the necessity of using English has overpowered antipathy towards English and English speakers. The adoption of English by the Irish is a case of language shift not accompanied by favorable attitudes towards English (see Macnamara 1973). In instances such as these, an instrumental rather than integrative orientation is more important in determining the speakers' choice" (p. 43).

speakers, and their functions; and (3) those which focus on applied concerns (e.g., language choice and usage, and language learning). Underlying each are questions of the nature of language attitudes, their causes, and their effects."

Important point: "individuals can seldom choose what attitudes to have toward a language or variety. Attitudes are acquired as a factor of group membership, as part of the process of enculturation in a particular speech community, and thus basic to its characterization.

It is because attitudes toward communicative performance are generally culturally determined that they are so strongly influenced by the social structure of the community in question.… While Whorf said that the structure of language may influence social structure, interaction, and thinking. [sic] Hymes suggests that the social structure may influence our attitudes toward particular kinds of language" (pp. 181-182).

(pp. 184-186): "Attitudes toward language in general, its nature, and its functions, may be captured by some of the expressions a speech community has that include reference to language [e.g., *She has a sharp tongue; he speaks with a forked tongue; silence is golden; Because of the mouth the fish dies* (Spanish proverb); *The squeaky wheel gets the grease*].… How language is used in various communities to categorize people according to the way they speak is also relevant, as are perceptions of how these categories should be ranked in value [e.g., terms such as *braggart, liar, gossip, big-mouth, eloquent, pedantic, tactful*, etc.].… Within a single speech community attitudes may vary concerning what constitutes 'speaking well' for males versus females, or for members of different social classes.… Attitudes about the nature of language and its functions may be inferred from derogatory comments which are made about it, or restrictions placed on its use.… Derogatory comments about language change, or what Roger Shuy calls 'the-world-is-going-to-hell-in-a-basket-and-language-is-leading-the-way syndrome', may also be enlightening, in that complaints about what is changing usually reveal attitudes about what has been valued as it was."

(pp. 187-188): Kachru (1982) developed a list of dichotomous attitude marking terms which can be used to describe/judge linguistic codes: aesthetic/unaesthetic, correct/incorrect, cultivated/uncultivated, developed/undeveloped, educated/uneducated, effective/ineffective, proper/improper, religious/non-religious, vigorous/non-vigorous. "These dimensions refer to both formal and functional aspects of codes, and judgements apply to both multiple languages and varieties of a single language" (p. 188).

(pp. 188-189): possible sources of attitudinal data include "the labels referring to language which may be used to characterize particular groups, whether selves or others, exemplifying the inclusive and exclusive functions of language diversity" (p. 188); "the use of language features in joking… which typically highlights stigmatized forms.… Joking usually involves mimicking marked phonological and lexical features, but may be extended to more complex stylistic factors…" (p. 188); "Examples abound from speech communities where personality or social characteristics are attributed to speakers of different varieties of a language [e.g., speakers of Tehrani Farsi are considered to be industrious, sociable and pleasure-loving, while speakers of Rashti Farsi are thought simple, stupid and dishonorable (with reference to sexual behavior)]" (p. 189).

Schiffman 1996 (p. 5): in talking about language policy, he offers a more widely-encompassing definition for language contact situations involving all aspects of language maintenance or shift: "*linguistic culture* [is] the set of behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language. That is, the beliefs (one might even use the term myths) that a speech community has about language (and this includes literacy) in general and its language in particular (from which it usually derives its attitudes towards other languages) are part of the social conditions that affect the maintenance and transmission of its language."

Synopsis of Definitions of Language Attitudes

It is clear that while there is a broad range of perspectives from which to define language attitude, the general unifying concepts about attitude are that it involves both beliefs and feelings, that it theoretically should influence behavior, and that there are a range of issues about which people have language attitudes, from opinions about one's own language, to foreign speakers of one's own language, to foreign languages, to official policies regarding languages. Different researchers in various fields (such as linguistics, social psychology, and sociology) focus on these different areas, and hence their definitions of language attitude reflect their perspectives. This explains in part why, as several researchers above noted, there is no one accepted definition of language attitudes.

One such difference of perspective is the behaviorist vs. mentalist definitions of attitude which Fasold (among others) discusses. As he points out, most researchers tend to follow the mentalist attitude, which is the one which breaks attitude down into feelings, beliefs and behavior. This statement is supported by the number of researchers who do not specifically say they are using a mentalist approach but all mention these three components. Also, those who do not specifically define attitude at all, but rather assume a commonly accepted definition, almost all invariably discuss these three components (without necessarily making it explicit that they consider them to *be* components of attitude). Such approaches (behaviorist vs. mentalist) are applicable both in attitudes of individual speakers and in those of populations of speakers; it is this latter group which often have an impact on language policy and planning.

For the purposes of the present project, however, the most applicable definitions are those that focus on the individual speaker's attitudes towards his own language use. Since the objective of this language attitude survey is to find out how Hispanics feel about Spanish in relation to English, the wider perspectives that deal with issues of language planning, for instance, are not so relevant. The definitions examined above can help to direct the focus of the questions in the survey by making us more aware of the many directions that language attitude can take. This realization makes it easier to design a line of questioning that avoids issues that are not important to us specifically because both the relevant and irrelevant issues are at a conscious level in our awareness.

Definitions of Language Choice

Appel and Muysken 1987 (p. 22): they present a variety of perspectives from which language choice may be viewed, and the dominant concept which each perspective entails (listed in parentheses): societal perspective (domains); language perspective (diglossia); the speaker's perspective (decision tree); interactional perspective (accommodation); and functional perspective (functional or specialization).

(pp. 118-120): in reference to the unconscious choices bilinguals make in code-switching, they list six possible functions that the switching might serve: (1) referential, e.g., topic-related switching: "it often involves lack of knowledge of one language or lack of facility in that language on a certain subject. Certain subjects may be more appropriately discussed in one language, and the introduction of such a subject can lead to a switch. In addition, a specific word from one of the languages involved may be semantically more appropriate for the given concept.… This type of switching is the one that bilingual speakers are most conscious of. When asked why they switch they tend to say that it is because they do not know the word for it in the other language, or because the language chosen is more fit for talking about a given subject" (p. 118). (2) Directive, in the sense that the hearer is being directly involved somehow, either by being included or excluded by the switch to the other language. "All participant-related switching can be thought of as serving the directive function of language use" (p. 119). (3) Expressive: "Speakers emphasize a mixed identity through the use of two languages in the same discourse.… For fluent bilingual Puerto Ricans in New York, conversation full of code switching is a mode of speech by itself, and individual switches no longer have a discourse function" (p. 119). (4) Phatic, indicating a change in the tone of the conversation; also known as metaphorical switching (e.g., Gumperz and Hernández-Chavez 1975). (5) "The metalinguistic function of code switching comes into play when it is used to comment directly or indirectly on the languages involved. One example of this function is when speakers switch between different codes to impress the other participants with a show of linguistic skills" (p. 120). (6) "Bilingual language usage involving switched puns, jokes, etc. can be said to serve the poetic function of language" (p. 120).

Bentahila 1983 (p. 50): "Any speaker of any language has at his disposition a range of language varieties; Gumperz (1964) uses the term 'linguistic repertoire' to describe the full range of styles which an individual needs to fulfil all his communicative needs in the most appropriate way. The speaker's ability to choose the appropriate variety for any particular purpose is part of his communicative competence; the choice is not random, but has been shown to be determined by aspects of the social organization of the community and the social situation where the discourse takes place. In this the bilingual is not strikingly different from the monolingual; it is simply that he has to choose not only between different varieties of the same language, but also between his two languages."

(pp. 51-52): "The choice of language may … be influenced by factors relating to the individual speaker, to the particular languages and their associations, or to aspects of the social situation. It seems likely that a particular choice may be influenced by a number of variables, possibly of differing weights.…"

Coulmas 1997 (p. 31): "People make linguistic choices for various purposes. Individuals and groups choose words, registers, styles and languages to suit their various needs concerning the communication of ideas, the association with and separation from others, the establishment or defense of dominance. Although it is obvious that people are endowed with the ability to adjust their linguistic repertoires to ever new circumstances, languages are for certain purposes constructed as if they were a matter of destiny, an autonomous power quite beyond the control of their speakers, both as individuals and groups. In this connection the notion of the mother tongue plays a crucial role, as it is more often than not understood as an entity which exists in its own right rather than merely a first skill to be supplemented throughout one's lifetime with others according to one's needs. This [author] takes issue with this notion by investigating a number of cases where people choose languages, including their mother tongue."

Edwards 1994 (p. 72): "Outright language choice is obviously available to bilingual individuals, and an illustrative example is found in Paraguay. Here, more than 90 per cent are bilingual in Guaraní and Spanish. Language choice is non-random, and heavily influenced by external constraints."

Fasold 1987 (pp. 180-181): Three kinds of language choice: (1) "whole languages", or the choice between two languages in a conversation; i.e., code-switching. (2) Code-mixing, "where pieces of one language are used while a speaker is basically using another language"; these pieces can be single words, or short phrases. (3) Variation within the same language. "This is the kind of language choice that often becomes the focus of attitude studies.… In these cases, a speaker must choose which set of variants to use within a single language in any given situation. When we consider within-language variation to be a kind of language-choice problem, then language choice is a possibility for monolingual speakers as well as bilinguals.

Of course, it is often the case that these three kinds of choice cannot be cleanly separated from each other. As we so often find in the study of sociolinguistics, the continuum concept serves us best. The three kinds of choice are best viewed as points on a continuum from relatively large-scale to relatively small-scale choices. The middle category, code-mixing, is very difficult to distinguish from the other two."

(p. 183): Three disciplines, three approaches for studying language choices: **sociology and domain analysis**, introduced by J. Fishman (1964, 1965, 1968e), who also proposed the concept of *domains* of language use (institutional contexts in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another). "Domains are taken to be constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants [e.g., the family domain]. Domain analysis is related to diglossia, and some domains are more formal than others. In a community with diglossia, the Low language is the one that will be selected in the family domain, whereas the High language will most often be used in a more formal domain, perhaps education."

(p. 187): **Social psychology**: "Sociologists typically approach a problem like language choice by searching for a social structure, such as domains, conducting a survey of a sample of the target population relating to the proposed social structure, and doing a statistical analysis of the results. Social psychologists, as you might expect, are more interested in people's psychological processes than in large societal categories. They, too,

often use surveys, samples, and statistics, but they search for individual motivations rather than social structures. In other words, social psychological research on language choice is more person-centered than society-centered."

Simon Herman's research on *overlapping situations* is one important SP approach: "As Herman sees the problem of language choice, a bilingual speaker finds himself in more than one psychological situation simultaneously. Herman talks about three kinds of situation: one concerned with the speaker's personal needs and the other two connected with social groupings. In a given situation, then, a speaker may feel herself pulled in different directions by her personal desire to speak the language she knows best and the language expected of her by the social group."

(pp. 188-189): Giles's accommodation theory: "Normally, accommodation takes the form of *convergence*, in which a speaker will choose a language or language variety that seems to suit the needs of the person being spoken to. Under some conditions, though, a speaker may fail to converge or he may even *diverge*. In other words, a person might make no effort at all to adjust his speech for the benefit of the other person and might even deliberately make his speech maximally unlike the other person's. This will happen when the speaker wants to emphasize his loyalty to his own group and dissociate himself from his interlocutor's group.…

Convergence and divergence do not require the selection of one choice (that is, convergence, nonconvergence, and divergence). It is possible to make numerous combinations of choices among the variants within a language, as well as to use strategies such as translating portions of one's discourse or slowing down the rate of speech."

(pp. 192-193): **Anthropology:** "Where social psychology looks at language choice from the point of view of an individual dealing with the structure of his society, and sociology attempts to explain it in terms of abstract social constructs, anthropology has a different orientation. Anthropologists are most interested in discovering the *values* of a sociocultural group, and the cultural rules of behavior that reveal those values. Like the social psychologist, the anthropologist is interested in how the individual speaker is dealing with the structure of his society, but not in terms of his own psychological needs so much as how that person is using his language choices to reveal his cultural values. Since an individual can make different selections among the values allowed her by her culture at different times, anthropologists are interested in the minute analysis of particular interactions. Anthropologists, to a greater extent than sociologists and social psychologists, pay close attention to code-mixing and inherent variation, as well as to large-scale code-switches. To an anthropologist, each of these variations represents a change in the expression of cultural values, and this is what it is important to understand." Anthropologists also use a different methodology from the other two groups of researchers; where sociologists and social psychologists tend to rely on data from questionnaires and experiments, "[a]nthropologists place the highest value on normal, uncontrolled behavior." For this reason, their favored methodology is participant observation, living and participating in the community which they are studying.

Ferguson 1996 (pp. 272-273): discusses language choice more in its "official" context of language planning: "Many countries…, as a matter of national development or even of national existence, must answer a set of language questions. The policy decisions which

these answers constitute then require implementation, often on a large scale and over long periods of time.

Some of these questions are of *language choice*: What language(s) shall be the official language(s) of the government, used in laws, administration, and the armed forces? What language(s) shall be used as medium of instruction at the various levels of the educational system? What language(s) will be accepted for use on the radio, in publishing, in telegrams, and as school subjects?" (p. 272)

"Decisions on language questions are notoriously influenced by emotional issues such as tribal, regional and religious identification, national rivalries, preservation of elites, and so on. They may even go directly against all evidence of feasibility" (p. 273).

Gal 1979 (p. 97): In speaking about the bilingual population of Oberwart, Austria, she makes the following observations: "In any conversation, bilingual [speakers] have to choose among the languages available to them. The choice *between* languages is more salient linguistically and more important socially than style differences within each language. Yet in Oberwart there is a great deal of variation in the outcome of language choices. What appears to be the usual pattern for one speaker in a range of situations is rarely the same as anyone else's pattern. In fact, the nature of this variability renders static models of bilingual language use inadequate to the task of describing it. It is more useful to extend to language choice a model of variation derived from recent theories that link synchronic linguistic heterogeneity to diachronic change. In this way it is possible to describe Oberwart's present patterns of language choice so that they can be understood as both the products of social-historical forces and the sources of future changes in language choice." She considers that the attitudes the speakers have are part of what makes choice between languages more socially important than style-shifting within a given language.

Li 1994 (p. 6): "… language choice may occur at several different levels, ranging from small-scale phonetic variables such as the ones studied by Labov (1966, 1972a) to large scale discourse patterns such as address systems, conversation routines (e.g., greetings and partings), politeness strategies, and of course choices between languages."

Romaine 1995 (p. 12): refers to it as alternation or code-switching, "the extent to which the individual alternates between the two languages." Earlier, she comments, "in practically all the communities where switching and mixing of languages occurs it is stigmatized" (p. 5). She offers a formal definition in chapter 4: "I will use the term 'code-switching' in the sense in which Gumperz (1982: 59) has defined it as 'the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems.' In code-switched discourse, the items in question form part of the same speech act. They are tied together prosodically as well as by semantic and syntactic relations equivalent to those that join passages in a single speech act.… this kind of behavior can and routinely does occur in both monolingual and bilingual communities. Thus, I will use the term 'code' here in a general sense to refer not only to different languages, but also to varieties of the same language as well as styles within a language. This means that at the pragmatic level, all linguistic choices can be seen as indexical of a variety of social relations, rights and obligations which exist and are created between participants in a conversation.… There is an almost one-to-one relationship between language choice and social context, so that each variety can be seen as having a distinct place or function within

the local speech repertoire. Where such compartmentalization of language use occurs, norms of code selection tend to be relatively stable… "(p. 121). Code switching can be viewed from either a grammatical or a pragmatic perspective: the grammatical perspective attempts to account for linguistic constraints on code-switching; the pragmatic view proposes that switches are generally stylistic "and that code-switching is to be treated as a discourse phenomenon which cannot be satisfactorily handled in terms of the internal structure of sentences" (p. 121).

(p. 30): describes a study of a Puerto Rican community in New York City carried out by Fishman, Cooper and Ma (1971). Identifies five specific domains in which either Spanish or English was consistently used. "These domains served as anchor points for distinct value systems embodied in the use of Spanish as opposed to English. A domain is an abstraction which refers to a sphere of activity representing a combination of specific times, settings and role relationships.… [E]ach of these domains carried different expectations for using Spanish or English." The main point is that an appropriate language for a given domain is a value judgment.

(p. 95 & elsewhere [e.g., chapter 4]): despite common assumptions to the contrary, research shows that code-switching and language choice in a given interaction are not necessarily under the speaker's conscious control. "In [many] cases the bilingual may use the other language without actually being aware of doing so."

Saville-Troike 1989 (pp. 50-54): "Given the multiple varieties of language available within the communicative repertoire of a community, and the subset of varieties available to its subgroups and individuals, speakers must select a code and interaction strategy to be used in any specific context. Knowing the alternatives and the rules for appropriate choice from among them are part of speakers' communicative competence" (p. 50). The concept of *domain* plays an important role in her explanation of linguistic choice, and she uses Fishman's (1971, p. 587) definition of domain: "a socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community." Other elements that can play a role in language/variety choice include *focus* of the interaction (e.g., societal-institutional vs. social-psychological); *topic* of the conversation; *setting* and *participants* of the interaction. "Rules for language choice are usually not consciously formulated by native speakers…" (p. 54).

(pp. 59-60): code switching: she identifies various levels/types of code-switching, similar to Romaine: situational ("when the language change accompanies a change of topics or participants" p. 59) vs. metaphorical ("occurs within a single situation, but adds meaning to such components as the role-relationships which are being expressed. Since speaking different languages is an obvious marker of differential group membership, by switching languages bilinguals often have the option of choosing which group to identify with in a particular situation, and thus can convey the metaphorical meaning which goes along with such choice…" p. 60).

Sridhar 1996 (p. 51): "Who uses what language with whom and for what purposes?" Pertains primarily to bi- or multilingual individuals and implies the availability to them of linguistic choices and reasons for choosing one code from among several. Cites a basic assumption of sociolinguistics regarding multilingual speech communities from Elias-Olivares (1979,

p. 121): "In a heterogeneous speech community, with varying degrees of linguistic diversity and social complexity, speakers interact using different speech varieties drawn from a repertoire of choices which for the most part are not random. On the contrary, the distribution of usage of these choices is determined by several factors in the social communicative system of the community." Language domains are a very important concept in explaining/defining language choice; Fishman (1972 p. 437, cited in Sridhar) defines them as "who speaks what language to whom and when in those speech communities that are characterized by widespread and relatively stable multilingualism."

Synopsis of Definitions of Language Choice

In the area of language attitude, although there is not complete agreement on a definitive definition of the term, at least there are those who have attempted to offer concrete definitions. In the case of language choice, such a concrete definition is not forthcoming, although there does seem to be a general consensus on the process or action of choice. Perhaps the closest to a definition per se is Sridhar's question, "Who uses what language with whom and for what purposes?" It is perhaps significant to note that Sridhar, as well as many others, limits his conception of language choice to bilinguals, and language choice is manifested as code switching from situation to situation (although some also talk of code-switching or code-mixing within a single speech event). To account for other researchers' descriptions, who also include monolinguals in their views of language choice, the word "language" could be changed to "code", in which case both monolinguals and bilinguals would be accounted for: a speaker must determine the social and personal parameters of a given speech situation to determine which code (i.e., language, dialect, register) to use.

While I personally agree that language choice can be exercised by either monolinguals or bilinguals, for the purposes of developing the present language survey, a focus on bilinguals is more appropriate. Also, considering the American context of the Hispanics who are the subject of study, the broader idea of language choice as code-switching/code-mixing within a single speech event, rather than supposing that only a single language will be used in any encounter, will better serve our needs. Again, as with the discussions of language attitude, having these various issues of language choice brought to our conscious attention will make us more able to design an effective language survey.

Definitions of Language Shift

Appel & Muysken 1987 (pp. 32-33): "Such a process [of language shift] seems to be going on in many bilingual communities. More and more speakers use the majority language in domains where they formerly spoke the minority tongue. They adopt the majority language as their regular vehicle of communication, often mainly because they expect that speaking that language gives better chances for upward social mobility and economic success.…

Sometimes it seems that 'shift' can be equated with 'shift towards the majority or prestigious language', but in fact 'shift' is a neutral concept, and also shift towards the extended use of the minority language can be observed.… After a period of shift towards the majority language, there is often a tendency to reverse the process, because some people come to realize that the minority language is disappearing, and they try to promote its use. These defenders of the minority language are often young, active members of cultural and

political organizations that stand up for the social, economic and cultural interests of the minority group.…

… Knowledge of [the factors which govern language maintenance and shift] does not guarantee insight into the process of language shift, since people bring this about in their daily speech, and it is on this level that explanations for shift must be found.…

When a language is reduced in its function, which happens in the case of shift towards the majority language, generally speakers will become less proficient in it, i.e. *language loss* is taking place. Language shift linked up with loss will finally result in *language death*."

(pp. 41-42): "Language shift may come about slowly and go on for several generations, but especially in changing social situations it may be a rather fast process. This is often the case for immigrant groups. Tosi (1984) studied bilingualism and language shift among Italian immigrants in Bedford (Great Britain). The first-generation immigrants generally use a local Italian dialect as the principal medium of communication within the family. Until school age, their children mostly speak this dialect, only occasionally switching to English, and when there are several children in the household they often speak English among themselves. But English really gains influence when the children go to school and become more proficient in it. English will then inevitably be brought into the household: initially for use mainly with other siblings, but later also in interactions with the parents. A younger person will gradually learn to understand that the two languages are associated with two different value systems, and that these systems often collide with each other. This results in personal and emotional conflicts. Tosi points to the linguistic and cultural conflict between generations. The 'regular' conflict between two generations is accentuated because of differences in values, outlook and aspirations. These differences are symbolized in the language behaviour of the generations, i.e. the preference for Italian (dialect) vs. English.

The general pattern for language shift in immigrant groups is as follows. The first generation (born in the country of origin) is bilingual, but the minority language is clearly dominant, the second generation is bilingual and either of the two languages might be strongest, the third generation is bilingual with the majority language dominating, and the fourth generation only has command of the majority language. This is only a general pattern, and the picture for specific immigrant groups is different."

Baker 1996 (p. 42): "the fate of languages is often related to the manipulated politics and power bases of different groups in society. Language shift (in terms of numbers of speakers and uses) occurs through deliberate decisions that directly or indirectly affect languages and reflects economic, political, cultural, social and technological change. It is therefore possible to analyze and determine what causes language shift rather than simply believing language shift occurs by accident. Thus, those who support an evolutionary perspective on languages may be supporting the spread of majority languages and the replacement of minority languages. Evolutionists who argue for an economic, cost-benefit approach to languages, with the domination of a few majority languages for international communication, hold a myopic view of the function of languages. Languages are not purely for economic communication. They are also concerned with human culture, human heritage, the value of a garden full of different colored flowers rather than the one variety."

(p. 43): "Generally, **language shift** is used in the literature to refer to a downwards language movement. That is, there is a lessening of the number of speakers of a language, a decreasing saturation of language speakers in the population, a loss in language proficiency, or a decreasing use of that language in different domains. The last stages of language shift are called language death.…" Some factors influencing language shift include out-migration and in-migration, possible forced or voluntary movement of minority language groups within a particular geographical region, intermarriage between different language communities. "With the growth of mass communications, information technology, tourism, road, sea and air links, minority languages seem more at risk. Bilingual education, or its absence, will also be a factor in the ebb and flow of minority and majority languages" (p. 44).

Crystal 1997 (p. 215): "The gradual or sudden move from the use of one language to another."

Edwards 1994 (p. 102): identifies "shift" as "mov[ing] completely from one [language] variety to another (i.e., without retaining the first in some bidialectal or bilingual accommodation)."

Fasold 1987 (p. 213): "Language shift and, the other side of the coin, language maintenance are really the long-term, collective results of language choice. Language *shift* simply means that a community gives up a language completely in favor of another one. The members of the community, when the shift has taken place, have collectively chosen a new language where an old one used to be used. In language *maintenance*, the community collectively decides to continue using the language or languages it has traditionally used. When a speech community begins to choose a new language in domains formerly reserved for the old one, it may be a sign that language shift is in progress."

(pp. 216-217): "Certain conditions tend to be associated with language shift in several studies of the phenomenon. Perhaps the most basic condition is societal bilingualism. It is important to notice that bilingualism is not a sufficient condition for shift, although it may be a necessary one. Almost all cases of societal language shift come about through intergenerational switching (Lieberson 1972, 1980)." Other causes consistently found in various studies include *migration*, both in-migration and out-migration; *industrialization* and other economic changes; *school language* and other government pressures; *urbanization*; higher *prestige* for the language being shifted to; *smaller population* of speakers of the language being shifted from. "[H]owever, where the same factors were cited independently by many scholars, there has been very little success in using any combination of them to predict when language shift will occur" (p. 217).

(p. 240): "There is a sense in which it is possible to answer 'yes' to the question of whether it is possible to predict language maintenance or shift. Language shift will occur only if, and to the extent that, a community desires to give up its identity as an identifiable sociocultural group in favor of an identity as a part of some other community."

Gal 1979 (p. 17): "Given [the] social determinants of language shift, the process of shift, once it starts, is very much the same as other kinds of linguistic change. It consists of the socially motivated redistribution of synchronic variants to different speakers and different social environments."

Hornberger & King (p. 300): from Dorian's (1982, p. 46) definition: "The gradual displacement of one language by another in the lives of the community members. This occurs most typically where there is a sharp difference in prestige and in the level of official support for the two (or more) languages concerned."

Jaspaert & Kroon 1988 (p. 158): they present a slightly different perspective of language shift, looking at it from the individual's point of view rather than from that of the speech community as a whole: "One of the basic concepts of [our] research project … is language shift. It is not the purpose of this project to study the intergenerational process of language shift, but the shift that takes place when individuals decide to use the newly acquired language instead of their mother tongue. Central to our understanding of the phenomenon is that shift can only occur in those instances in which the individual has a choice. The observation that an Italian immigrant who used to speak Italian to the doctor in Italy now speaks Dutch to the doctor in the Netherlands [is interesting] from an intragenerational point of view when the doctor in the Netherlands also masters Italian." Such a perspective does not follow the most commonly accepted definition of language shift, which certainly does have an intergenerational component, but rather conflates the term 'language shift' with the individual nature of language choice. In this sense, I think that their use of the term is misleading and possibly confusing in a field where concrete definitions of these terms are hard enough to come by.

Richards et al. 1992 (p. 204-205): "A change ('shift') from the use of one language to the use of another language. This often occurs when people migrate to another country where the main language is different, as in the case of immigrants to the USA and Australia from non-English-speaking countries. Language shift may be actively encouraged by official government policy, for example by restricting the number of languages used as media of instruction. It may also occur because another language, usually the main language of the region, is needed for employment opportunities and wider communication. Language shift should not be confused with language change."[2] Note here how Richards specifically excludes the idea that Jaspaert & Kroon are trying to establish. It would seem that researchers in general are more in agreement with Richards et al.'s definition than with Jaspaert & Kroon's, since none of the others try to explain language shift on the individual level.

Romaine 1995 (p. 39): identifies three elements important to language maintenance of ethnic groups within a larger group with a dominant language (e.g., English in the US), and conversely, of course, a lack in any of these areas can affect language shift to the dominant language from the ethnic one: institutional support, status and demographic concentration.

(p. 40): in some cases (not all),"language shift involves bilingualism (often with diglossia) as a stage on the way to monolingualism in a new language." Key external factors which can influence (but not necessarily cause) language maintenance, shift or

---

[2] Richards et al. define language change as "change in a language which takes place over time. All living languages have changed and continue to change. For example, in English, changes which have recently been occurring include the following: (a) the distinction in pronunciation between words such as *what* and *Watt* is disappearing; (b) *hopefully* may be used instead of *I hope, we hope, it is to be hoped*; (c) new words and expressions are constantly entering the language, e.g., *drop-out*, *alternative society, culture shock*" (pp. 199-200). Note that this definition refers to evolution within a single language rather than changing between two languages.

death include "numerical strength of the group in relation to other minorities and majorities, social class, religious and educational background, settlement patterns, ties with the homeland, degree of similarity between the minority and majority language, extent of exogamous marriage, attitudes of majority and minority, and patterns of language use."

Saville-Troike 1989 (pp. 205-206): importance of instrumental vs. affective (what Romaine calls integrative) functions of language in language maintenance or shift. "The surest symptom of impending language loss is… when parents no longer see a reason to transmit it to their children, and may even view it as a handicap to their children's education and advancement" (p. 206). She quotes Dorian (1980): "Language loyalty persists so long as the economic and social circumstances are conducive to it; but if some other language proves to have greater value, a shift to that other language begins" (p. 206).

(pp. 206-210): factors involved in language maintenance or shift: "Stability of multiple languages in contact … occurs where each has a unique domain (cf. Fishman 1972; 1985), and is thus reserved a continuing function in society…. A second major consideration in language maintenance, shift, and spread is the social organization and ecology of the community or communities involved, and attitudes related to these factors. This may include the nature of their boundary mechanisms and political organization…. It is not coincidental that the more 'visible' minorities [immigrants to the United States], who have encountered negative attitudes towards their assimilation from the dominant groups, are most likely to have maintained separate linguistic and cultural identity.

Attempts at forced assimilation may also support language maintenance.… Imperialistic expansion may also result in language spread, as evidenced in history by periods of expansion and then contraction of Turkish, Quechua, Nahuatl, and Portuguese [such spread often involves shifting from another, previous language, rather than merely adding a new language to the community's repertoire]" (pp. 206-207).

"Patterns of marriage and kinship may also be factors in maintenance or shift.… The role of women in the community is also significant. Where they are uneducated and remain in the home they tend to remain monolingual and contribute to maintenance of the 'mother' tongue; where they are educated, bilingual, and participate in trade or other external activities, exactly the opposite has been observed" (p. 208).

"Language shift may be concomitant with the change in the nature and identity of the entire speech community: 'Frequently the community itself is transformed along with the linguistic switch. That is, only as the community is surrounded and absorbed into a larger community, does it tend to drop its old language and to take on that of a larger group' (Swadesh 1948: 234).

Geographic or social segregation, on the other hand, contributes to maintenance.… The spread of modern technology and mass media are additional forces for social and linguistic integration. On this dimension, attitudes toward the desirability of change play a major role.

The social stratification of a community is also relevant, including the degree of access that speakers of low prestige languages and varieties have to those which are more prestigious, and to jobs which require their use.

A third major area of consideration is values and world view. In a broad sense, this includes attitudes toward borrowing foreign words, and the value placed on uniqueness versus homogeneity" (pp. 208-209).

Schiffman 1990 (p. 1): "language shift occurs domain by domain (rather than speaker by speaker or community by community), until the abandoned language controls no domains at all."

Sommer 1997 (p. 55): "The process of language shift [is] defined as the replacement of one language in the repertoire of a community-wide bilingual group by another one."

(pp. 56-57): "According to previous studies of language shift … the whole process usually follows the pattern detailed [here]…: (1) Language shift takes place in speech communities where the recessive language has a minority status, i.e., the language has low prestige in official contexts and it experiences no institutionalized support in language policy and planning. (2) Because of the outspoken or implicit stigmatization of their language, speakers of the minority language tend to develop an ambiguous attitude towards the maintenance of their unbalanced bilingual situation. (3) The replace of the recessive language by the dominant one leads to the gradual restructuring of language use within the speech community. This process is typically accompanied by modified patterns of language acquisition. While older speakers can still be regarded as balanced bilinguals with full proficiency in the recessive and dominant languages, younger speakers tend to learn the dominant language first. Among the latter group of speakers the use of the recessive language will gradually become restricted to specialized contexts and/or particular interlocutors (Dressler 1982)."

Tabouret-Keller 1968 (p. 107): outlines Fishman's attempt to define language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: "[it] is concerned with the relationship between change or stability in habitual language use, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social or cultural processes, on the other hand, when populations differing in language are in contact with each other."

Wiley 1996 (pp. 122-123): emphasizes the importance of two (or more) languages in contact in the process of language shift, which he defines (according to Bright 1992, vol. 4, p. 311) as "the gradual or sudden move from the use of one language to another, either by an individual or a group." He points out that it can be either "a gradual process, or it can be explicitly planned.…   Assuming its inevitability, some scholars have attempted to determine the rate of language shift among immigrant groups. In the case of the United States, Veltman's analysis of census data (1983) determined the rate of shift to be roughly a three generational one (from native language monolingualism to English monolingualism). However, several of Veltman's assumptions have been questioned. Most curious is his exclusion of bilingualism as a circumstance equal to monolingualism. If bilingualism is not considered, language shift is seen as an either-or phenomenon toward a *language* rather than toward *multilingualism* (Wiley, 1990-1991, in press)."

Synopsis of Definitions of Language Shift

Language shift is generally agreed to be the shift *in a language community* (this community perspective is key) from the use of one language to the use of another, for a variety of reasons as noted by individual researchers above. This is not to be confused with bilingualism, where two different languages may be used interchangeably in different situations. In the case of shift, while some speakers of the community may still speak or understand the previous language, it has been preferentially dropped in favor of another language, and the community may eventually reach the stage where the previous language is lost entirely, where no one in the community understands it any longer. While one group of researchers does attempt to propose a definition of shift on the individual level, this does not appear to be a popular stand, since they are the only ones who suggest it. This very likely has to do with the fact that what they propose as individual language shift is in reality language choice.

In considering the definitions of the other two terms, I took into account how they might be used to help design the language attitude survey. In the case of language shift, it is more accurate to say that the survey will help to determine if such a process is underway in the Hispanic community in the United States. Between the various perspectives of what constitutes language shift and the results obtained from the survey, it should be possible to reach a conclusion regarding the linguistic status of the target group: as a community, are they maintaining themselves as bilinguals, or are they in the process of language shift?

Critical review of the literature on language attitude surveys

In this section, I will offer a brief review of the various articles, book chapters and books that I found which dealt with language attitude surveys in one way or another. This will not be a comprehensive review in the sense that I will not discuss every single article I read; rather, I will focus on those which offered substantial information, and especially those which included appendices of their survey questions or detailed discussions of how they designed them. A great many of the journal articles I found presented very little more than a discussion of the investigators' findings or opinions, without providing much background information on such things as research design, a literature review, or even the author's theoretical orientations. In fact, several of these articles were no more than 3-5 pages long. There is really very little that a researcher can say in that small space, and indeed most of these short articles did not have information useful for our purposes. For this reason, this review tends to be weighted more in favor of books and book chapters than journal articles, although there are a few of the latter that merited inclusion.

As discussed in the section above on language attitudes, the focus of the attitudes can range from a speaker's attitude towards the language in general to his attitude towards speaking it, to others' speech habits, or even towards another language altogether, for instance in learning a second language. All of these various perspectives were represented in the readings I found, as well as some others such as language attitudes of a speech community in general, and their impact on language policy. In fact, many investigators make reference to language policy and/or language planning, and even discuss it at length in relation to linguistic problems of various regions (e.g., Edwards 1995; Hae 1990; Mehrotra 1985; Omdal 1995; Schiffman 1990). But of

the works I read, a large majority talked more about the effect of language policy on language usage rather than the effect of language attitude on policy. In this sense, they did not have great applicability to our primary interest in attitudes; nor do they offer much useful information on the development of language questionnaires, and so I do not discuss them in any length.

One very important researcher who does stress the importance of language attitudes in language policy and planning is Charles Ferguson. He is perhaps one of the first linguists to recognize the importance of a common language as a unifying factor in nation-building efforts, although many linguists, of course, recognize a common language as a defining factor of a community. Over the course of several essays ("The language factor…", "On sociolinguistically oriented language surveys", "Sociolinguistic settings…", "National attitudes…",), he discusses the importance of surveying the attitudes of the speakers to understand what kinds of changes might or might not be successful in planning efforts. He also describes some surveys that have been undertaken in various countries, as well as possible survey techniques (in "On sociolinguistically oriented language surveys"). However, his description of these techniques is fairly general, and he offers no specific suggestions or methodologies for developing a questionnaire. So ultimately, although his work is useful for providing background information on the importance of a well-designed survey, it does not directly contribute to this effort to develop such a questionnaire.

Fasold (1987) and Romaine (1995) also discuss at some length the importance of language attitude in language planning (e.g., the case of Ireland and Irish Gaelic). However, their discussions of language planning do not directly pertain to the development of surveys. On the other hand, both authors do provide very useful information to the development of surveys, and so their influence will definitely be felt in developing our own survey. For example, Romaine points out an important consideration in deciding on how to word a question:

> Part of the reason for … discrepancies between attitudes and behavior has to do with how the questions are phrased. In discussing attitudes towards Scottish Gaelic, Baker (1988: 127) points out that the questions given to respondents were relatively impersonal, e.g. Do you think that the Gaelic language is relatively important for the Scottish people as a whole? A positive answer to this question should not be taken to imply a positive attitude to Gaelic because it requires no action or commitment on the part of the respondent. It is easy to agree that certain things are good in principle, particularly when they affect others and not ourselves. In this case, the form of the question too suggests that the language is important. (318)

In addition, in an earlier chapter, she offers some sample language attitude questions taken from a survey for Panjabi speakers in Britain. Some of these questions can be adapted for our use, and so they will appear (either as-is or in modified form) in the questionnaire.

Fasold also devotes an entire section to methods of measuring language attitudes. One important point that he makes is the distinction between direct and indirect methods: "A totally direct method would require subjects to respond to a questionnaire or interview questions that simply ask their opinions about one or another language. A totally indirect method would be designed to keep the subject from knowing that her language attitudes were being investigated" (1987, p. 149). Based on the example that he gives, his point seems to be that, while indirect methods may be able to more accurately gauge language attitudes, they are not ideally suited to a questionnaire format. He also discusses open and closed questions on questionnaires, and the

advantages or disadvantages of each in obtaining the desired data (p. 152). Such points are things we must keep in mind, and so such information will be very useful for the current project. On the other hand, he also devotes a section to social applications of the study of language attitudes, and the first topic he mentions is group identity (pp. 158-164). Such a discussion is potentially quite relevant to a study of Puerto Rican attitudes towards Spanish in a primarily English-speaking environment.

Edwards (1995, p. 98) offers the interesting point (mentioned above in the definitions of language attitude) that *attitudes* are often confused with *beliefs*, and so many purported language attitude surveys are actually language belief surveys. The question he offers as an example is "Is a knowledge of French important for your children, yes or no?" Such a question, he maintains, measure belief more than attitude. Thus, this is important for us to keep this in mind in wording our questions. On the other hand, he offers no other sample surveys or examples of "attitude" questions. Therefore, this one point is the only important contribution his work makes to the current questionnaire.

Sadanand's (1993) work on language attitude toward English among laborers in India is potentially more useful. In his article, Assessing attitudes to English and language use, he outlines in detail his own methodology, as well as offering a description of other possible methodologies and their advantages and disadvantages. In addition, he describes the measurement scale he developed on which to rate the responses of his respondents (pp. 125-127). This provides some ideas to keep in mind when it comes time to tally the results of the current questionnaire. He also reproduces his questionnaire as an appendix. Unfortunately, all of the questions fall into the trap described by Edwards above; that is, they actually measure beliefs rather than attitudes. It might be possible to modify some of them, but at this juncture it is not a guaranteed outcome. So his measurement scale is the most significant aspect to contribute to the current work. Another team of researchers who also fall into the same trap is Jaspaert and Kroon (1988); they transcribe the six questions which constitute the "attitudinal component of the questionnaire," and only one of the questions actually measures attitude instead of beliefs: "I'd much rather use Dutch than Italian." All of the other questions ask respondents to rate their beliefs about the beauty or utility of one language over the other, which as Edwards indicates, do not really require them to take a personal stand on any issue. In addition, since there are only six questions, it is also not a very comprehensive measure of attitude, so it does not seem to be worth the effort to include them.

Bentahila (1983) researched the language attitude of bilingual Arabic-French speakers in Morocco. Similarly to Sadanand, he also describes his survey design in great detail in the fourth chapter of his book. This chapter deals with language choice, which of course, in the case of Hispanics in the United States, is a significant issue in daily interactions. Attitude plays an important role in language choice in the situations where interactants share more than one common language, so some carefully designed survey questions regarding language choice might be able to reveal attitudes of which the speaker is not necessarily even aware. Therefore, Bentahila's description of his language choice survey can offer some very good ideas. He uses both open and closed questions; the latter are certainly easier to code and analyze, but the former are potentially more revealing because they allow the respondents to answer freely. Also, later in the book he reproduces some of the actual questions from his surveys. These will also be helpful in designing the present survey.

Saville-Troike (1989) is another author who offers an overview of language attitude survey methods. Unfortunately, it is a very general overview, and reveals no concrete information that can be directly used in designing a questionnaire. Rather, it gives some ideas of pitfalls that should be avoided, and the purposes which different methods serve. Therefore, it offers nothing substantive in the way of help for the present project. Other investigators offer similar types of information, describing the types of methods they used to obtain their data and detailing the administration of these methods, but then not offering specific information on the types of questions they asked, for instance, or, what would have been even better, a sample list of questions from their surveys. Among this type of article are included those by De Houwer and Wölck (1997), Weil and Schneider (1997), Bister-Broosen (1997), Ehret (1997), Gorter and Ytsma (1988), Dua (1986), Polomé (1990), Sibayan (1975), Appel and Muysken (1987), and von Gleich and Wölck (1994). Polomé (1990) did, however, raise an important point to keep in mind regarding status of the members of the target population and effective question design:

> It was … essential to clearly define the social roles played by individuals. Accordingly, two types of questionnaires were devised – one for the average citizen and another for definite sub-groups of society.… [Q]uestions relative to social activities had to be phrased differently depending upon whether they applied to a rural or to an urban population, and in the case of the rural population, a distinction had to be made between men and women. (p. 40)

As he notes, it is very important to be aware of the social structure of the target population and to design the instrument accordingly. Otherwise, the researcher may find that the questionnaire he has so meticulously elaborated is useless for measuring what he wants it to measure in the target population.

Rubin's well known work on bilingual usage in Paraguay, in contrast to the studies mentioned above, contains a great deal of useful information. Not only does she offer different possibilities for rating results of questionnaires, she also offers some specific questions and the kinds of categories she divided them into (e.g., ambiguous vs. unambiguous questions in terms of the degree of intimacy of the speech situation). Her survey is more geared more specifically towards language use per se than towards language attitudes, and as such might not be completely applicable to the present need, but it certainly offers a guide as to how questions might be worded. And it is possible that with some careful reflection on exactly what type of information is being sought, some of the questions might be adapted and reworded to serve the purposes of this survey.

Haugen (1972) also offers similar useful information in his article. He describes in detail the types and categories of questions he includes in his questionnaire, and offers one or two questions as examples. The real value of his contribution, however, is in how he interprets his data, which offers clues to other researchers as to how they might design and interpret their own surveys. So while there may not be a great deal that can be directly included in the present survey, the information gained from Haugen helps with other aspects of design and evaluation.

Mohan Lal (1986), in his study of convergence and language shift in Bangalore City, makes a major contribution to the present effort because he reproduces part of his questionnaire in the text of his study. The part reproduced covers both sociocultural and linguistic usage data on the informants, so not all of it can be directly applied to the current effort. Nevertheless, some of the questions will be quite helpful for revealing language usage and perhaps indirectly language

attitude. As with other cases, it will also be possible to modify the format or wording of some of the questions to make them more applicable to measurement of language attitudes.

Adegbija (1994) similarly reproduces segments of his personal interview questions in his sociolinguistic study of Sub-Saharan Africa, and in his appendix, he reproduces the entire questionnaire he used. He discusses research methodologies as well, so in addition to obtaining some actual questions which might possibly serve the needs of the present work, there is also background information on appropriate approaches and design for a given objective. Ansre (1975) is another who reproduces his questionnaire in an appendix to his work. In his case, his main focus is actual language use, but in that survey he also includes some language attitude questions which could be incorporated into the questionnaire being developed. The same is true of Bolton and Luke (1985), and in addition, they raise one more point emphasized by many researchers that must be borne in mind when designing and implementing questionnaires: the inherent weakness of questionnaires that rely on self-report responses. As they say, however,

> there is … a cline here between more-or-less 'factual' responses and responses largely of the 'opinion' variety (see Fishman 1968), and, in fact, it will be possible for the investigators to check the consistency of many of the responses, by for example correlating place of origin with knowledge of Chinese dialects, or proficiency in English with professed language behavior.
> In the literature it has been frequently emphasized … that whenever possible, self-report measures should be balanced by other, more objective, measures of language proficiency and behavior, including language tests of some kind. (p. 50)

While it may not be possible within the scope of this current project to plan for other types of measurement of language proficiency, it should be possible to vary the types of questions between "factual" and "opinion," direct and indirect, in such as way as to make the correlations of which Bolton and Luke (among many others) speak.

Of course all of the studies mentioned to this point have had clear research questions in mind to guide the focus of their investigations; without such a focus, it is nearly impossible to design a useful survey. Nevertheless, not all of the researchers is equally adept at explicitly identifying what it is they are looking for, and it is only as one continues to read the work that it becomes obvious what the main point of the study is. Hornberger (1987) and García et al. ("Spanish language use and attitudes"), however, are exceptions to this lack of specificity. They not only mention the purpose of their investigations, but they both go a step beyond to specifically state the research questions they proposed to investigate (Hornberger, p. 120; García et al., p. 476). In addition, Hornberger offers an excerpt of her questionnaire in the appendix of her paper. These two details make her paper in particular very useful for the present purposes.

Another source that is probably one of the best resources for the current project is Torres's (1997) study of Puerto Rican discourse in the New York City area. While her main focus is not language attitudes per se, but rather issues of shift and code-switching, still the work is invaluable if for no other reason than that she is studying a population very similar to the one proposed for investigation in the present study (the only difference being that her study was carried out in New York, and the present study will focus on the United States in general). However, in addition to this advantage of similarity of populations under study, she also does have some information on language attitudes, since issues of language maintenance and shift

necessarily involve attitudes. Also, and perhaps most importantly, in the appendix she reproduces the questionnaire for parents which she used.

Gal (1979) does the same in her study of bilingual language usage in Oberwart, Austria. In reality, her appendix lists questions she used in face-to-face interviews, but such questions could be easily modified to accommodate a written questionnaire format. Also, her focus was more on language usage than on language attitudes per se. However, as noted above, such questions can help to reveal unconscious attitudes or beliefs, where direct attitude questions may not receive such honest answers. In addition to this valuable index, Gal also discusses the intricacies of language attitude in a specific bilingual population, which can certainly suggest directions for the present survey as well.

Hofman and Cais (1984) similarly offer the text of their questionnaire in their article on measuring children's attitudes to language maintenance and shift. The country on which they focus is Israel, and their article is actually quite short, so the most useful part is definitely the questionnaire. However, it is not a long one, and the range of possible responses is quite limited (they are closed questions, and answers are generally limited only to Agree or Disagree). So while some of the questions might be adaptable to the purposes of the current proposed questionnaire, overall the questions of Hofman and Cais are of only limited utility.

Sreedhar et al. (1984) go one step further than reproducing a questionnaire in their index. They have compiled an entire book which is a questionnaire bank for sociolinguistic surveys in India. Such a question bank should be invaluable in suggesting directions for questions and how to word them. Obviously, since their context is India, questions cannot be simply copied from their survey into the present one. However, it should be a fairly simple matter of modifying the wording to fit a different context. Another questionnaire in its entirety which could prove very useful is the unpublished "Encuesta sociolingüística" developed by Dr. Utta von Gleich for a study she did in Ayacucho, Peru in 1989.

Another text which may be useful to a limited degree is Davies's (1995) study of linguistic variation and attitudes in Mannheim-Neckarau. In the body of her text she explains her questionnaire and interviewing procedures, which can be helpful for others designing such surveys. She also reproduces her questionnaire in an appendix; unfortunately, it is all in German, without a translation, and so much of its utility for the current questionnaire is lost. On the other hand, in another appendix she offers what she calls linguistic biographies of her informants, which are written in English. In these, she does offer their responses to some attitude and belief questions; from these, it should be possible to infer the original question asked, and so all may not be lost.

Bradac (1990) is another researcher whose work is only liminally useful to the construction of the present questionnaire. In his article, he reviews the different types of language attitude studies and summarizes the general trend of the findings. Having a guideline of this sort for results in general may help to focus the questions in the sense of offering ideas for directions to take with the line of questioning. In other words, depending on the research interests of the investigator, questions could be designed to elicit information to see if the target population of the study tends to fall into the same trends as the overall body of research seems to suggest. Overall, however, the information offered by Bradac is so general as to not be directly useful in the current effort.

A final article is Zentella's (1990) article on language attitudes of Puerto Ricans who migrate between the mainland and the island. Her focus is on New York Puerto Ricans, while the present work is more concerned with Hispanics from other countries of Latin America in the United States. Nonetheless, it can be useful in identifying some possible issues to take into consideration in dealing with Hispanics who feel they may have divided their loyalties between the U.S. and their respective countries of origin. Unfortunately, she does not offer any specific information on the development of her research instruments, so this is another article whose main usefulness lies in its ability to shed light on the sociocultural situation of the target population.

Language Attitude Surveys

The design of the following instruments has been guided by the following general research questions.

1. What do parents, students, and other community members believe about Spanish and English language and literacy in the U.S or around the world, and the opportunities such knowledge can open up for immigrant students at school, in the local community, and for their social mobility in the future?

2. What is the relationship between language use at home, at school and in the community? How are spoken and written Spanish and English actually taught and/or used at school, at home, and in the local community?

Question one deals specifically with language beliefs and attitudes of a range of community members. Question two, on the other hand, pertains more to language use patterns. These patterns will be best revealed by having different surveys geared specifically towards each of the different subpopulations to be measured (i.e., parents and community members, and students). Many of the questions on the two surveys are the same, but at the same time, enough are different so that informants will not have to wade through questions that are obviously not pertinent to one group or the other. Also, by having a different survey for each group, a distinct picture comes out of the perspectives of each group, and they can then be compared across groups to come up with a coherent picture of the community. This same approach was used by various of the researchers whose work I have relied on in constructing the present questionnaires (e.g., Torres 1997, Adegbija 1994, Sreedhar et al. 1984). For this reason, two separate questionnaires were developed, rather than one comprehensive, very long one in which perhaps not all the questions would be relevant to all consultants.

Question three, in this writer's opinion, is not one that can be investigated in the direct framework of a questionnaire, but rather, through other triangulated data collection methods such as observation in the community and the classroom, examination of school documentation (e.g., curricula, etc.) and interpretation of the data generated by the questionnaires. For this reason, there are no questions on the surveys that seek to directly respond to this question. Rather, the questions on the surveys are geared more toward seeking answers to questions one and two above.

Some of the questions in the following surveys have been taken directly from the following sources, or are modified versions of their questions: Adegbija (1994, appendix), Ansre (1975, appendix 1), Bentahila (1983, p. 141), Gal (1979, appendix 1), Hofman and Cais (1984,

appendix), Hornberger (1987, appendix 1), Mohan Lal (1986, pp. 3-8), Romaine (1995, p. 303), Rubin (1968, pp. 518-520), Sadanand (1993, appendix), Sreedhar et al. (1984), Torres (1997, appendix) and von Gleich (1989). Numerous other questions have been developed independently of these sources, based on a need in the questionnaire not filled by these other sources. Due to space constraints, it was decided not to footnote each question to indicate its source, especially since many of the questions appear either identically or in similar form in several different sources (e.g., personal history and language use questions).

I also decided to divide the questionnaires into three sections to make the different types of information easier to locate in tallying, and also to make it possible to differentiate between language use and language attitudes in the final results. The three sections are personal history data, language use questions, and language attitude questions. The majority of the sources mentioned above did not make these kinds of divisions in their questionnaires (except for perhaps differentiating personal information from anything related to linguistic data), although some of them did. Also, in some of the surveys that did have separate divisions for language use vs. language attitudes, it was apparent from the mix of questions in a given section that it is not always easy to distinguish between *use* and *attitude* (and similarly, as discussed in a previous section, between *attitudes* and *beliefs*). Frequently I found questions relating to attitude (according to the various definitions listed in the first section of this document) included in sections on language use. I have tried to the best of my ability to differentiate strictly between use (behaviors) and attitudes (including beliefs) in placing the questions in their appropriate sections.

References

Adegbija, E. (1994). *Language attitudes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A sociolinguistic overview*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ansre, G. (1975). Madina: Three polyglots and some implications for Ghana. In S. Ohannessian, C. A. Ferguson and E. C. Polomé (Eds.), *Language surveys in developing nations: Papers and reports on sociolinguistic surveys* (pp. 159-177). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Appel, R. and Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

Baker, C. (1996). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 2nd ed. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bentahila, A. (1983). *Language attitudes among Arabic-French bilinguals in Morocco*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bister-Broosen, H. (1997). Communication in the Alemannic area: Language use and attitudes in Colmar and Freiburg. In M. Pütz (Ed.), *Language choices: Conditions, constraints and consequences* (pp. 305-326). Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.

Bolton, K. and Luke, K.-K. (1985). The Sociolinguistic Survey of Language in Hong Kong: The background to research and methodological considerations. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 55,* pp. 41-56.

Bradac, J. J. (1990). Language attitudes and impression formation. In H. Giles and W. P. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social psychology*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Coulmas, F. (1997). A matter of choice. In M. Pütz (Ed.), *Language choices: Conditions, constraints, and consequences* (pp. 31-54). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*, 4th ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

De Houwer, A. and Wölck, W. (1997). An ethnographic method for studying attitudes towards child language. In M. Pütz (Ed.), *Language choices: Conditions, constraints and consequences* (pp. 275-286). Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.

Davies, W. (1995). *Linguistic variation and language attitudes in Mannheim-Neckarau*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Dua, H. R. (1986). *Language use, attitudes and identity among linguistic minorities [A case study of Dakkhini Urdu speakers in Mysore]*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin Books.

Ehret, R. (1997). Language attitudes and the linguistic construction of ethnic identity: The case of Krio in Sierra Leone. In M. Pütz (Ed.), *Language choices: Conditions, constraints and consequences* (pp. 327-337). Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.

Fasold, R. (1987). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). Diglossia. *In Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959-1994* (pp. 25-39). Ed. Thom Huebner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). Language development. In *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959-1994* (pp. 40-47). Ed. Thom Huebner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). The language factor in national development. In *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959-1994* (pp. 267-271). Ed. Thom Huebner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). On sociolinguistically oriented language surveys. In *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959-1994* (pp. 272-276). Ed. Thom Huebner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). Sociolinguistic settings of language planning. In *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959-1994* (pp. 277-294). Ed. Thom Huebner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). National attitudes toward language planning. In *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959-1994* (pp. 295-303). Ed. Thom Huebner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). Language and national development. In *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959-1994* (pp. 313-323). Ed. Thom Huebner. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

García, O., Evangelista, I., Martínez, M., Disla, C. and Paulino, B. (198x). Spanish language use and attitudes: A study of two New York communities. *Language in Society, 17*, pp. 475-511.

Gorter, D. and Ytsma, J. (1988). Social factors and language attitudes in Friesland. In R. van Hout and U. Knops (Eds.), *Language attitudes in the Dutch language area*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

Hae, K. S. (1990). A survey of sociolinguistic studies in Korea. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 82*, pp. 70-23.

Haugen, E. (1972). Semi-communication: The language gap in Scandinavia. In E. Haugen (Ed.), Hofman, J. E. and Cais, J. (1984). Children's attitudes to language maintenance and shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 50,* pp. 147-153.

Hornberger, N. H. (1987). Bilingual education and Quechua language maintenance in Highland Puno, Peru. *NABE Journal*, Winter, pp. 117-139.

Hornberger, N. H. and King, K. (1997). Bringing the language forward: School-based initiatives for Quechua language revitalization in Ecuador and Bolivia. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up* (pp. 299-319). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jaspaert, K. and Kroon, S. (1988). The relationship between language attitudes and language choice. In U. Knops and R. van Hout (Eds.), *Language attitudes in the Dutch language area* (pp. 157-171). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris Publications.

Knops, U. and van Hout, R. (1988). Language attitudes in the Dutch language area: An introduction. In U. Knops and R. van Hout (Eds.), *Language attitudes in the Dutch language area* (pp. 1-23). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris Publications.

Li, W. (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Massey, D. A. (1986). Variations in attitudes and motivation of adolescent learners of French as a second language. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Review canadienne des langues vivantes, 42*, 3, pp. 607-618.

McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation, and standards. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 3-46). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mehrotra, R. R. (1985). Sociolinguistic surveys in South Asia: An overview. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 55*, pp. 115-124.

Mohan Lal, S. (1986). *Convergence and language shift in a linguistic minority: A sociolinguistic study of Tamils in Bangalore City*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Münstermann, H. and van Hout, R. (1988). Language attitudes and the prediction of dialect use. In U. Knops and R. van Hout (Eds.), *Language attitudes in the Dutch language area* (pp. 173-188). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris Publications.

Omdal, H. (1995). Attitudes toward spoken and written Norwegian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 115*, pp. 85-106.

Polomé, E. C. (1975). Problems and techniques of a sociolinguistically-oriented survey: The case of the Tanzania survey. In S. Ohannessian, C. A. Ferguson and E. C. Polomé (Eds.), *Language surveys in developing nations: Papers and reports on sociolinguistic surveys* (pp. 31-50). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics,* 2nd ed. Essex, UK: Longman Publishers.

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism,* 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Rubin, J. (1968). Bilingual usage in Paraguay. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of language* (pp.513-531). Paris: The Hague.

Sadanand, K. (1993). Assessing attitudes to English and language use. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, XIX,* 1, pp. 123-139.

Saville-Troike, M. (1989). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*, 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Schiffman, H. F. (1990). The balance of power in multiglossic languages: Implications for language shift. *Language and Society Papers*, No. LD4. Seattle: University of Washington Interdisciplinary Research Committee on Language and Society.

Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge.

Sibayan, B. P. (1975). Survey of language use and attitudes towards language in the Philippines. In S. Ohannessian, C. A. Ferguson and E. C. Polomé (Eds.), *Language surveys in developing nations: Papers and reports on sociolinguistic surveys* (pp. 115-143). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Sreedhar, M. V., Dua, H. R. and Rajyashree Subbayya, K. S., eds. (1984). *Questionnaire bank for sociolinguistic surveys in India*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages, Ministry of Education and Culture.

Sridhar, K. K. Societal multilingualism. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 47-70). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tabouret-Keller, A. (1968). Sociological factors of language maintenance and language shift: A methodological approach based on European and African examples. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 107-117). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

von Gleich, U. (1989). "Encuesta sociolingüística." Unpublished language use survey. Hamburg: University of Hamburg, Centro de Investigación del Plurilingüismo (Center for Studies of Multilingualism).

von Gleich, U. and Wölck, W. (1994). Changes in language use and attitudes of Quechua-Spanish bilinguals in Peru. In P. Cole, G. Hermon and M. D. Martin (Eds.), *Language in the Andes* (pp. 27-50). Newark, DE: LAS.

Weil, S. and Schneider, H. (1997). In M. Pütz (Ed.), *Language choices: Conditions, constraints and consequences* (pp. 287-304). Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.

Wiley, T. G. Language planning and policy. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 103-147). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zentella, A. C. (1990). Returned migration, language, and identity: Puerto Rican bilinguals in dos worlds/two mundos. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 84*, pp. 81-100.

Selected Online Resources

American Tongues spoken by regional English speakers
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c8blqMALnA8&feature=related

Bibliography on Attitudes towards Language
http://www.terralingua.org/2/Bibliographies/AttitudesLgeBib.html

Bibliographies on Language Attitudes
http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/plc/clpp/

Consortium for Language Policy and Planning
http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/plc/clpp/

Code-switching
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_1BTFRG2lI4&feature=related

Development of Broadcast Standard US. English
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W68VaOuY6ew&feature=related

Diglossia
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fOT1OURwY4w&feature=related

Do you speak American?
http://www.pbs.org/speak/

Do young people speak the same as old people?
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PKsmw4GnxPc&feature=channel

Filmmakers@Google "The Linguists"
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gxI1MP3H92M

Investigating Language Attitudes: Social Meanings of Dialect, Ethnicity and Performance Peter Garrett, Nikolas Coupland and Angie Williams (2003)
http://www.uwp.co.uk/book_desc/1803.html

Is there a Standard English in England?
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vM5ejxFRBjM&feature=related

Jonathan M. Ccoy's Speech: A new Petition
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bMyp8y8SkUM

Language Shift Bibliography
http://www.ethnologue.com/show_subject.asp?code=LSH

Language Shift - Wikipedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Language_shift

Language Shift: Spanish in the United States
http://escholar.salve.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=pell_theses

Language Ideology
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Language_ideology

Language and Ideology Bibliography (CAL)
http://www.cal.org/topics/dialects/aae/bibliography/ideology.html

Language Maps and Ethnicity Maps
http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/plc/clpp/images/langmaps/index.html

Linguistic discrimination - African American English
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WWIbIA9BltQ

Linguistic Profiling - African American English
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EPGx1icFdLQ&feature=related

Many Tongues One Voice
http://www.abc.net.au/tv/messagestick/stories/s2690210.htm

Map of American English Dialects
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fGxlxOcS-tE&feature=related

Prescriptivists and Descriptivists
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BbqkjchOww8

Sarah Jones as a one-woman global village
http://vodpod.com/watch/1574355-ted-sarah-jones-one-woman

Sociolinguistics Bibliography
http://wrt-howard.syr.edu/Bibs/SOAN244bibs.html

Sociolinguistics Bibliography (SIL)
http://www.sil.org/sociolx/pubs/bibliography.asp

Sociolinguistics - Bibliography
http://www.uni-saarland.de/fak4/norrick/downloads/past_lecturescripts/vlsocio_bib.pdf

Sociolinguistics - Wikipedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociolinguistics

Spanish in the United States - Wikipedia
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spanish_in_the_United_States

The future of English Language
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w8mufJngOHQ&feature=related

US Language Attitudes
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4kW3K3OclnE

Wade Davis on Endangered Cultures
http://www.ted.com/talks/wade_davis_on_endangered_cultures.html

Why so many languages?
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=07m9Ru0nW68&feature=related

Language Attitude Survey for Parents and Community Members

Personal information

1. Age range: ☐ 16-20   ☐ 21-25   ☐ 26-30   ☐ 31-40   ☐ 41-50   ☐ 51-60   ☐ 60+

2. Sex: ☐ Male   ☐ Female

3. Occupation _____

4. Place of birth _____

5. Town or neighborhood where you live now   _____

6. How many years have you lived here?

    _____

7. Where did you live before you moved here? _____

8. Why did you move to the United States? _____

    _____

9. How many years did you attend school? _____

10. Where did you attend school (city/country)? _____

    _____

11. Where was your father born?   _____

12. What language does/did he speak as his first language? _____

13. Where was your mother born?   _____

14. What language does/did she speak as her first language? _____

15. Do you have children? Yes ___   No ___

16. Do they speak the same language(s) that you do? Yes ___ No _____

    If not, which languages do they know that you do not? _____

    Which languages do you know that they do not? _____

17. How do you identify yourself? (check all that apply or add your own)

    Hispanic   ___   Hispanic American   ___   Latino/a   _____
    Puerto Rican   ___   American   ___   Other   _____

Language use of parents (self)

18. What languages do you speak? _____

19. What language did you learn first?

   English _____   Spanish _____   Learned them both together _____

20. How old were you when you learned Spanish? _____   English? _____

21. In what contexts did you learn Spanish? In what contexts did you learn English? Check all that apply.

	Spanish	English
At home	_____	_____
At school	_____	_____
In the neighborhood	_____	_____
At work	_____	_____
From friends	_____	_____
Through movies/television	_____	_____
In your respective country of origin	_____	_____
In the United States	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____

22. How many years of formal training in the use of Spanish did you receive? _____

23. How many years of formal training in the use of English did you receive? _____

24. In what language were the majority of your classes during your formal education?

   in elementary school: _____   in high school: _____

   in college: _____

25. In what language are the majority of your children's classes taught?

   in elementary school: _____   in high school: _____

   in college: _____

26. Can you read in Spanish? _____   In English? _____   In both languages? _____

27. Do you buy more books, magazines and newspapers in Spanish or in English? _____

28. Can you write in Spanish? _____   In English? _____   In both languages? _____

29. Which language do you understand better?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

30. What language do you speak better?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

31. Do you watch more television programs in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

32. Do you listen to more radio stations in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

33. Do you think more in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

34. Do you dream in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

35. Do you pray in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

36. Do you count (numbers) in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

37. Do you tell jokes and stories in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

38. If you swear (curse), in what language do you swear?

Spanish _____ English _____ Both more or less equally _____

39. Do you have any monolingual friends who only speak English? Yes _____ No _____

40. Do you have any monolingual friends who only speak Spanish? Yes _____ No _____

41. Which language(s) (Spanish, English, or Both) do you use the most when you speak with the following people or in the following situations?

(a) at home:

spouse _____ mother _____ uncles/aunts _____

children _____ siblings _____ cousins _____

father _____ grandparents _____ nephews/nieces _____

friends _____ others _____

(b) outside the home:

spouse _____   grandparents _____   boss _____

children _____   uncles/aunts _____   co-workers _____

father _____   cousins _____   strangers _____

mother _____   nephews/nieces _____   others? _____

siblings _____   friends _____

(c) in specific social domains:

market/stores _____   festivals _____   church _____

post office _____   social gathering places _____

other places you commonly visit _____

(d) under specific emotional circumstances:

extremely angry _____   anxious _____   overjoyed _____

surprised _____   terrified _____   overstressed _____

extremely happy _____   hurt _____   begging for help _____

 very embarrassed _____

(e) specific topics of conversation:

	with family	with friends/neighbors	with co-workers	with others
work	_____	_____	_____	_____
business	_____	_____	_____	_____
travel	_____	_____	_____	_____
politics	_____	_____	_____	_____
religion	_____	_____	_____	_____
health	_____	_____	_____	_____
music	_____	_____	_____	_____
family matters	_____	_____	_____	_____

Language use of children

42. What languages do your children speak? _____

43. What language did your children learn first?

English _____   Spanish _____   Learned them both together _____

44. How old were your children when they learned Spanish? _____ English? _____

45. In what contexts did your children learn Spanish? In what contexts did they learn English? Check all that apply.

	Spanish	English
At home	_____	_____
At school	_____	_____
In the neighborhood	_____	_____

	Spanish	English
At work	_____	_____
From friends	_____	_____
Through movies/television	_____	_____
In your respective country of origin	_____	_____
In the United States	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____

46. How many years of formal training in the use of Spanish did they receive? _____

47. What kinds of materials (texts and other teaching aids) were/are used in the classroom?

_____

_____

48. How many years of formal training in the use of English did they receive? _____

49. What kinds of materials (texts and other teaching aids) were/are used in the classroom?

_____

_____

50. In what language are the majority of your children's classes taught?

in elementary school: _____ in high school: _____

in college: _____

51. Can they read in Spanish?   Yes ____   No ____   Don't know _____

52. In English? Yes _____   No ____   Don't know _____

53. In both languages equally well? Yes ____   No ____   Don't know _____

54. Do they have more books and magazines in Spanish or in English? _____

55. Can they write in Spanish?   Yes ____   No ____   Don't know _____

56. In English? Yes _____   No _____   Don't know _____

57. In both languages equally well? Yes _____   No _____   Don't know _____

58. Which language do they understand better?

   Spanish ___   English ____   Both more or less equally ___   Don't know ____

59. What language do they speak better?

   English ____   Spanish ___   Both more or less equally _____   Don't know _____

60. Do they watch more television programs in Spanish or in English?

   English ___   Spanish ____   Both more or less equally _____   Don't know _____

61. Do they listen to more radio stations in Spanish or in English?

   English ___   Spanish ____   Both more or less equally ____   Don't know _____

62. Do they dream in Spanish or in English?

   English ___   Spanish ____   Both more or less equally ____   Don't know _____

63. Do they pray in Spanish or in English?

   English ___   Spanish ____   Both more or less equally ____   Don't know _____

64. Do they count (numbers) in Spanish or in English?

   English ___   Spanish ____   Both more or less equally ____   Don't know _____

65. Do they tell jokes and stories in Spanish or in English?

   English ___   Spanish ____   Both more or less equally ____   Don't know _____

66. If they swear (curse), in what language do they swear?

   English ___   Spanish ____   Both more or less equally ____   Don't know _____

67. Which language(s) (Spanish, English, or Both) do they use the most when they speak with the following people or in the following situations?

(a) at home:

   mother _____   grandparents _____   friends _____

   father _____   uncles/aunts _____   boyfriend/girlfriend _____

   siblings _____   cousins _____

(b) outside the home:

   father _____   grandparents _____   friends _____

   mother _____   uncles/aunts_____   neighbors _____

   siblings _____   cousins _____   others? _____

6

(c) under specific emotional circumstances:

extremely angry _____   anxious _____   overjoyed _____

surprised _____   terrified _____   overstressed _____

extremely happy _____   hurt _____   begging for help _____

very embarrassed _____

(e) specific topics of conversation:

	with family	with friends/neighbors
travel	_____	_____
politics	_____	_____
religion	_____	_____
health	_____	_____
music	_____	_____
entertainment	_____	_____
family matters	_____	_____

68. Do you make a special effort with your children to maintain the use of Spanish?

Yes _____ No _____

69. What does this effort consist of? _____

_____

70. Do you make a special effort with your children to make them speak English?

Yes _____ No _____

71. What does this effort consist of? _____

_____

72. Do you teach Spanish to your children?   Yes _____ No _____

73. Do you teach English to your children? Yes _____ No _____

Language attitudes and beliefs

74. If you learned to speak Spanish and English at the same time, which of them do you consider

to be your mother tongue?   Spanish _____   English _____

75. Which language do you *prefer* to speak when you have a choice?

English _____ Spanish _____ No preference _____

76. Since when have you preferred to speak this language? _____

_____

77. What are your reasons for this preference? _____

_____

78. Indicate whether you would choose Spanish, English or Both for the following statements.

	Spanish	English	Both
I like the language and am proud of it.	____	____	____
Most Hispanics speak this language not because they are obliged to, but because they like it.	____	____	____
I can express myself best in this language.	____	____	____
I will try my best to encourage my children to speak this language.	____	____	____
I feel at home when I talk in this language.	____	____	____
Knowledge of this language is necessary for national unity.	____	____	____
This language gives me a sense of individual identity.	____	____	____
Knowledge of this language is a symbol of prestige and social status.	____	____	____

79. To what degree do you associate the following attributes with the Spanish language? With English? Rate them on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 meaning not at all, 2 meaning somewhat, and 3 meaning very much.

	Spanish	English		Spanish	English
rich	____	____	prestigious	____	____
precise	____	____	grammatical	____	____
sweet	____	____	literary	____	____
musical	____	____	technologically oriented	____	____
harsh	____	____	pure	____	____
powerful	____	____	ancient	____	____
expressive	____	____	rustic	____	____
idiomatic	____	____	romantic	____	____

80. To what degree do you associate the following attributes with *speakers* of Spanish? of English? Rate them on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 meaning not at all, 2 meaning somewhat, and 3 meaning very much.

	Spanish	English		Spanish	English
miser	____	____	practical	____	____
optimist	____	____	honest	____	____
polite	____	____	honest	____	____

	Spanish	English		Spanish	English
friendly	____	____	reserved	____	____
orthodox/traditional	____	____	close knit	____	____
cultured	____	____	educated	____	____
lazy	____	____	rich	____	____
cunning/sly	____	____	enterprising	____	____
brave	____	____	fanatics	____	____
proud	____	____	liberal	____	____

81. Is the Spanish you speak different from the Spanish spoken by Hispanics from different Latin American countries? Yes _____   No _____

82. Is it different from the Spanish spoken by other Hispanics in the United States?

Yes ___   No ___

83. In either case, how is it different? _____

_____

84. When you hear someone speak Spanish, can you determine any of the following?

	yes	no		yes	no
what job they have	____	____	where they are from	____	____
their level of education	____	____	where they live	____	____

How do you know these details? _____

_____

85. Do you think that someone else listening to you speak could determine the same details about you when you speak Spanish?

	yes	no		yes	no
what job you have	____	____	where you are from	____	____
your level of education	____	____	where you live	____	____

9

86. Could they determine these same details if they heard you speaking English?

	yes	no		yes	no
what job you have	____	____	where you are from	____	____
your level of education	____	____	where you live	____	____

87. How would you describe good Spanish? _____

_____

_____

88. How would you describe bad Spanish? _____

_____

_____

89. Do you speak good Spanish? _____ Explain. _____

_____

90. How would you describe good English? _____

_____

_____

91. How would you describe bad English? _____

_____

_____

92. Do you speak good English? _____ Explain. _____

_____

93. Are you conscious of your pronunciation of English words and careful about speaking "correct" English?   Yes _____   No _____

94. Are you conscious of your pronunciation of Spanish words and careful about speaking "correct" Spanish?   Yes _____   No _____

95. Are there some things that can be said in one language but not in the other? Yes ___ No ___

Please give one example: _____

_____

96. Do you ever mix Spanish and English when you speak?   Yes _____   No _____

97. Do you ever switch from one to the other during a conversation? Yes ____   No ____

98. Why do you mix them? _____

_____

_____

_____

99. To what degree do any of the following reasons play a role in your mixing or switching?

	very much	somewhat	not at all
appropriate words/phrases easily available in the other language	_____	_____	_____
easier to talk about certain topics in the other language	_____	_____	_____
symbol of prestige to use another language, or words from that language	_____	_____	_____
helps in communicating with speakers of other languages	_____	_____	_____
promotes a sense of integration with the other speech community	_____	_____	_____
I know all these languages equally well	_____	_____	_____

100. Do you know others who mix languages?   Yes _____ No _____

101. How do you feel about mixing languages?

It is good _____   It is bad _____   Other response _____

_____

102. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about mixing or switching languages?

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
Educated people should not mix their languages	____	____	____
Unless a community speaks a pure language, it cannot maintain its distinct identity	____	____	____
If you mix languages, you will end up knowing no language properly	____	____	____
Where more than one language is spoken, communication becomes easier if people use mixed language	____	____	____
Mixed languages are not grammatical	____	____	____

Your language will become corrupt if you borrow from other languages ____ ____ ____

The purer a language, the more powerful it will be ____ ____ ____

In literature, language should not be mixed ____ ____ ____

Teachers should not encourage children to mix languages ____ ____ ____

There is no harm in mixing languages at home ____ ____ ____

In formal situations languages should not be mixed ____ ____ ____

103. Indicate the group that you think mixes more:

    Hispanics from other LA countries in the US   ____

    Puerto Ricans   ____

104. Do your children mix the languages?   Yes _____   No _____

105. Do you tell them not to mix languages?   Yes _____   No _____

106. Is it important for you that your children learn Spanish?   Yes _____   No _____

107. Why or why not? _____

_____

_____

108. Is it important that your children learn English?   Yes _____   No _____

109. Why or why not? _____

_____

_____

110. Who should teach the children Spanish? Parents ___   Schools _____   Both ____

111. Who should teach the children English? Parents ___   Schools _____   Both ____

112. Do you have any association or organization in your own community?   Yes __   No ___

113. If so, are you a member of any of them?

	Yes	No
cultural	____	____
religious	____	____
language	____	____
political	____	____
literary	____	____

other   ____   ____   (specify) _____

114. If you are not a member of such organizations, why not?

I am not interested _____   They have a narrow-minded outlook ____

They do not fulfill my needs _____

115. How involved are other members of your community in these organizations?

	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	
cultural	_____	_____	_____	
religious	_____	_____	_____	
language	_____	_____	_____	
political	_____	_____	_____	
literary	_____	_____	_____	
other	_____	_____	_____	(specify)_____

116. Are you a member of any language or community organizations run by other speech communities (i.e., not Hispanic)?   Yes _____   No _____

117. If so, for what reasons are you a member? Check all that apply.

It is a prestigious group _____   There is social/political pressure to join _____

It is useful to know the culture/   It helps in integration with other groups _____
  literature of other groups _____

Other reasons _____

118. Do you think that your children will maintain the use of Spanish as they grow up?

Yes __   No ____   Don't know _____

119. What are the advantages of Spanish-English bilingualism for Hispanics? Check all that apply.

Access to a broader range of cultures _____   Access to education and science ___

Access to money and prestige _____   Source of enriched experience _____

No advantage _____

120. What are the disadvantages of Spanish-English bilingualism for Hispanics? Check all that apply.

Leads to neglect of Spanish and domination of English _____

Leads to lack of proficiency in both Spanish and English _____

Leads to contradictions between the two cultures _____

Leads to mixing of the two languages _____

Leads to loss of identity _____

No disadvantage _____

121. Do you regret being bilingual (if you are)? Yes _____ No _____ No opinion _____

122. Do you think that the prestige of speaking Spanish in the US has improved at all in the last 10 years? Yes _____ No _____

Why do you think this way? _____

_____

123. Do you think that there should be a greater effort made on the part of policy makers for bilingual education programs in Spanish and English? Yes _____ No _____

Why or why not? _____

_____

124. What should be done to increase the importance of Spanish? _____

_____

125. Should Americans be encouraged to learn Spanish? If so, why? _____

_____

126. What is your opinion of the English-Only movement in the United States? _____

_____

_____

127. What do you think of Hispanics who speak only English and never Spanish? _____

_____

128. Has it ever happened to you that a person who you know can speak Spanish keeps switching back to English when you talk to them? Yes _____ No _____

129. What is your reaction when this happens? _____

_____

130. Why do you think that some Hispanic children always reply in English even when spoken to in Spanish? _____

_____

131. Do you think that Hispanic children in the US are losing touch with their culture? Yes __

No _____ Don't know _____

132. How useful do you think Spanish and English are for the following purposes? Rate them on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 meaning not at all, 2 meaning somewhat, and 3 meaning very much.

	Spanish	English
for getting jobs	_____	_____
for conducting business	_____	_____
for higher education	_____	_____
for social mobility and prestige	_____	_____
for higher salaries	_____	_____
for promoting religious unity in the community	_____	_____
for creating a sense of unity within the community	_____	_____
for spreading social and cultural values	_____	_____
for literature	_____	_____
for music	_____	_____
for science and technology	_____	_____
for communication with other communities	_____	_____
for integration with other communities	_____	_____
for international diplomacy	_____	_____
other (specify) _____	_____	_____

133. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding U.S.-born Americans?

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
I would accept them as business partners	____	____	____
I would invite them to be a guest in my house	____	____	____
I would like to work with them in the same office, factory or other work environment	____	____	____
I would be friends with them	____	____	____
I would like to have them as a neighbor	____	____	____
I would not object to establishing a relationship with them through marriage	____	____	____
I would accept them as a leader or boss	____	____	____
I would accept them as an assistant	____	____	____
I would rely on them in confidential matters	____	____	____
I would like them as a co-tenant or roommate	____	____	____

I would not mind eating in their house   ____   ____   ____

I would participate with them in sports and games   ____   ____

Please indicate your opinion (Agree, Disagree, or No opinion) concerning the following statements:

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
134. To be Hispanic you need to speak Spanish.	____	____	____
135. Hispanics who don't know Spanish divide the community.	____	____	____
136. All Hispanics should also be able to speak English.	____	____	____
137. I want my children to be bilingual.	____	____	____
138. It is important to communicate in English at home.	____	____	____
139. English is essential for any professional training.	____	____	____
140. Spanish is changing because of contact with English.	____	____	____

141. In what way(s) has Spanish changed? _____

_____

142. English is changing because of contact with Spanish.	____	____	____

143. In what way(s) has English changed? _____

_____

144. It is important to me to speak Spanish.	____	____	____
145. Hispanic young people in the US don't want to speak Spanish.	____	____	____
146. Hispanics young people in the US don't know how to speak Spanish well.	____	____	____
147. It is better to teach English to Hispanic children as early as possible.	____	____	____
148. It is not good for our children to learn two languages (Spanish and English) when they are still young.	____	____	____
149. I believe that students would learn more effectively if they were taught in their mother tongue.	____	____	____
150. A person who does not know how to speak Spanish can learn to speak it perfectly.	____	____	____

151. My knowledge of English and ability to speak it fluently
       make me feel superior to those who don't know it.   ____   ____   ____

152. My knowledge of Spanish and ability to speak it fluently
       make me feel superior to those who don't know it.   ____   ____   ____

153. Hispanics should adopt foreign ways of life
       when they go abroad.   ____   ____   ____

154. American culture has destroyed Hispanic culture.   ____   ____   ____

155. Hispanics in the US have maintained
       their culture.   ____   ____   ____

156. Hispanics in the US have maintained Spanish.   ____   ____   ____

157. Hispanics in the US suffer discrimination.   ____   ____   ____

158. Hispanics in the US suffer discrimination
       because of language problems.   ____   ____   ____

159. Hispanics in the US are united.   ____   ____   ____

160. Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Are there any comments
     you would like to make about the questionnaire?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Language Attitude Survey for Students

Personal information

1. Age range: ☐ 7-15   ☐ 16-20   ☐ 21-25

2. Sex: ☐ Male   ☐ Female

3. Level of schooling completed to date _____

4. Are you still in school?   Yes _____   No _____

5. Place of birth _____

6. Town or neighborhood where you live now   _____

   _

7. How many years have you lived here?   _____

8. Where did your family live before you moved to the US? _____

9. Why did your family move to the US? _____

   _____

10. Where have you attended school (city/country)? _____

    _____

11. Where was your father born?   _____

12. What language does/did he speak as his first language? _____

13. What is his occupation? _____

14. Where was your mother born?   _____

15. What language does/did she speak as her first language? _____

16. What is her occupation? _____

17. Do your parents speak the same language(s) that you do?   Yes _____ No _____

    If not, which languages do they know that you do not? _____

    Which languages do you know that they do not? _____

18. How do you identify yourself? (check all that apply or add your own)

    Hispanic   ___   Hispanic American   ___   Latino/a   _____
    Puerto Rican   ___   American   ___   Other   _____

Language use

19. What languages do you speak? _____

20. What language did you learn first?

English _____   Spanish _____   Learned them both together _____

21. How old were you when you learned Spanish? _____   English? _____

22. In what contexts did you learn Spanish? In what contexts did you learn English? Check all that apply.

	Spanish	English
At home	_____	_____
At school	_____	_____
In the neighborhood	_____	_____
At work	_____	_____
From friends	_____	_____
Through movies/television	_____	_____
In your respective country of origin	_____	_____
In the United States	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____

23. How many years of formal training in the use of Spanish have you received? _____

24. What kinds of materials (texts and other teaching aids) were or are used in your class?

_____

_____

25. How many years of formal training in the use of English have you received? _____

26. What kinds of materials (texts and other teaching aids) were or are used in your class?

_____

_____

27. In what language were or are the majority of your classes taught?

in elementary school: _____   in high school: _____

in college: _____

28. Can you read in Spanish? _____   In English? _____   In both languages? _____

29. Do you have more books, magazines and newspapers in Spanish or in English? _____

30. Can you write in Spanish? _____   In English? _____   In both languages? _____

31. Which language do you understand better?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

32. What language do you speak better?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

33. Do you watch more television programs in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

34. Do you listen to more radio stations in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

35. Do you think more in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

36. Do you dream in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

37. Do you pray in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

38. Do you count (numbers) in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

39. Do you tell jokes and stories in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

40. If you swear (curse), in what language do you swear?

   Spanish _____   English ____   Both more or less equally _____

41. Do you have any friends who only speak English?   Yes ____   No ____

42. Do you have any friends who only speak Spanish?   Yes ____   No ____

43. Which language(s) (Spanish, English, or Both) do you use the most when you speak with the following people or in the following situations?

(a) at home:

   mother _____   uncles/aunts _____

   father _____   cousins   _____

   siblings _____   friends   _____

   grandparents _____   others   _____

3

(b) outside the home:

father _____ grandparents _____ friends _____

mother _____ uncles/aunts _____ strangers _____

siblings _____ cousins _____ others? _____

(c) in specific social domains:

market/stores _____ festivals _____ church _____

at school during classes _____ at school between classes _____

social gathering places (specify) _____

other places you commonly visit (specify) _____

(d) under specific emotional circumstances:

extremely angry _____ anxious _____ overjoyed _____

surprised _____ terrified _____ overstressed _____

extremely happy _____ hurt _____ begging for help _____

very embarrassed _____

(e) specific topics of conversation:

	with family	with friends/neighbors
travel	_____	_____
politics	_____	_____
religion	_____	_____
health	_____	_____
music	_____	_____
entertainment	_____	_____
family matters	_____	_____

Language attitudes and beliefs

44. If you learned to speak Spanish and English at the same time, which of them do you consider to be your mother tongue?   Spanish _____   English _____

45. Which language do you *prefer* to speak when you have a choice?

English _____   Spanish _____   No preference _____

46. Since when have you preferred to speak this language? _____

_____

47. What are your reasons for this preference? _____

    _____

48. Indicate whether you would choose Spanish, English or Both for the following statements.

	Spanish	English	Both
I like the language and am proud of it.	____	____	____
Most Hispanics speak this language not because they are obliged to, but because they like it.	____	____	____
I can express myself best in this language.	____	____	____
When I have children, I will try my best to encourage them to speak this language.	____	____	____
I feel at home when I talk in this language.	____	____	____
Knowledge of this language is necessary for national unity.	____	____	____
This language gives me a sense of individual identity.	____	____	____
Knowledge of this language is a symbol of prestige and social status.	____	____	____

49. To what degree do you associate the following attributes with the Spanish language? With English? Rate them on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 meaning not at all, 2 meaning somewhat, and 3 meaning very much.

	Spanish	English		Spanish	English
rich	____	____	prestigious	____	____
precise	____	____	grammatical	____	____
sweet	____	____	literary	____	____
musical	____	____	technologically oriented	____	____
harsh	____	____	pure	____	____
powerful	____	____	ancient	____	____
expressive	____	____	rustic	____	____
idiomatic	____	____	romantic	____	____

50. To what degree do you associate the following attributes with *speakers* of Spanish? of English? Rate them on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 meaning not at all, 2 meaning somewhat, and 3 meaning very much.

	Spanish	English		Spanish	English
miser	____	____	practical	____	____
optimist	____	____	honest	____	____
polite	____	____	honest	____	____
friendly	____	____	reserved	____	____
orthodox/traditional	____	____	close knit	____	____
cultured	____	____	educated	____	____
lazy	____	____	rich	____	____
cunning/sly	____	____	enterprising	____	____
brave	____	____	fanatics	____	____
proud	____	____	liberal	____	____

51. Is the Spanish you speak different from the Spanish spoken by Hispanics from different countries of Latin America? Yes _____   No _____

52. Is it different from the Spanish spoken by other Hispanics in the US?

Yes ___ No ___

53. In either case, how is it different? _____

_____

54. When you hear someone speak Spanish, can you determine any of the following?

	yes	no		yes	no
what job they have	____	____	where they are from	____	____
their level of education	____	____	where they live	____	____
How do you know these details? _____					

_____

55. Do you think that someone else listening to you speak could determine the same details about you when you speak Spanish?

	yes	no		yes	no
your family's background	____	____	where you are from	____	____
your social behavior	____	____	where you live	____	____

56. Could they determine these same details if they heard you speaking English?

	yes	no		yes	no
your family's background	____	____	where you are from	____	____
your social behavior	____	____	where you live	____	____

57. How would you describe good Spanish? _____

_____

_____

58. How would you describe bad Spanish? _____

_____

_____

59. Do you speak good Spanish? _____ Explain. _____

_____

60. How would you describe good English? _____

_____

_____

61. How would you describe bad English? _____

_____

_____

62. Do you speak good English? _____ Explain. _____

_____

63. Are you conscious of your pronunciation of English words and careful about speaking "correct" English?   Yes ____   No _____

64. Are you conscious of your pronunciation of Spanish words and careful about speaking "correct" Spanish?   Yes ____   No _____

65. Are there some things that can be said in one language but not in the other? Yes ___ No __

Please give one example: _____

_____

66. Do you ever mix Spanish and English when you speak?   Yes _____   No _____

67. Do you ever switch from one to the other during a conversation? Yes ____   No ____

68. Why do you mix them? _____

_____

69. To what degree do any of the following reasons play a role in your mixing or switching?

	very much	somewhat	not at all
appropriate words/phrases easily available in the other language	_____	_____	_____
easier to talk about certain topics in the other language	_____	_____	_____
symbol of prestige to use another language, or words from that language	_____	_____	_____
helps in communicating with speakers of other languages	_____	_____	_____
promotes a sense of integration with the other speech community	_____	_____	_____
I know both these languages equally well	_____	_____	_____

70. Do you know others who mix languages?   Yes _____   No _____

71. How do you feel about mixing languages?

It is good _____   It is bad _____   Other response _____

_____

72. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about mixing or switching languages?

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
Educated people should not mix their languages	____	____	____
Unless a community speaks a pure language, it cannot maintain its distinct identity	____	____	____
If you mix languages, you will end up knowing no language properly	____	____	____
Where more than one language is spoken, communication becomes easier if people use mixed language	____	____	____
Mixed languages are not grammatical	____	____	____
Your language will become corrupt if you borrow from other languages	____	____	____
The purer a language, the more powerful it will be	____	____	____
In literature, language should not be mixed	____	____	____
Teachers should not encourage children to mix languages	____	____	____
There is no harm in mixing languages at home	____	____	____

In formal situations languages should not be mixed   ____   ____   ____

73. Indicate the group that you think mixes more:

Puerto Ricans from the Island _____

Hispanics from other countries of Latin America? _____

74. When you have children, is it important to you that they learn Spanish? Yes ___ No ___

75. Why or why not? _____

_____

_____

76. When you have children, is it important to you that they learn English? Yes ___ No ___

77. Why or why not? _____

_____

_____

78. Who should teach children Spanish? Parents _____   Schools _____   Both ____

79. Who should teach children English? Parents _____   Schools _____   Both ____

80. What are the advantages of Spanish-English bilingualism for Hispanics? Check all that apply.

Access to a broader range of cultures _____ Access to education and science _____

Access to money and prestige _____   Source of enriched experience _____

No advantage _____

81. What are the disadvantages of Spanish-English bilingualism for Hispanics? Check all that apply.

Leads to neglect of Spanish and domination of English _____

Leads to lack of proficiency in both Spanish and English _____

Leads to contradictions between the two cultures _____

Leads to mixing of the two languages _____

Leads to loss of identity _____

No disadvantage _____

82. Do you regret being bilingual (if you are)? Yes ____ No ____ No opinion ____

83. Do you think that the prestige of speaking Spanish in the US has improved at all in the last 10 years? Yes _____ No _____

Why do you think this way? _____

_____

84. Do you think that there should be a greater effort made on the part of policy makers for bilingual education programs in Spanish and English? Yes ____ No ____

Why or why not? _____

_____

85. What should be done to increase the importance of Spanish? _____

_____

86. Should U.S.-born Americans be encouraged to learn Spanish? If so, why? _____

_____

87. What is your opinion of the English-Only movement in the United States? _____

_____

_____

88. What do you think of Hispanics who speak only English and never Spanish? _____

_____

89. Has it ever happened to you that a person who you know can speak Spanish keeps switching back to English when you talk to them? Yes _____ No _____

90. What is your reaction when this happens? _____

_____

91. Why do you think that some Hispanic children always reply in English even when spoken to in Spanish? _____

_____

92. Do you think that Hispanic young people in the US are losing touch with their culture? Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____

93. How useful do you think Spanish and English are for the following purposes? Rate them on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 meaning not at all, 2 meaning somewhat, and 3 meaning very much.

	Spanish	English
for getting jobs	_____	_____
for conducting business	_____	_____
for higher education	_____	_____
for social mobility and prestige	_____	_____

for higher salaries   _____ _____

for promoting religious unity in the community   _____ _____

for creating a sense of unity within the community   _____ _____

for spreading social and cultural values   _____ _____

for literature   _____ _____

for music   _____ _____

for science and technology   _____ _____

for communication with other communities   _____ _____

for integration with other communities   _____ _____

for international diplomacy   _____ _____

other (specify) _____   _____ _____

94. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding U.S.-born Americans?

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
I would invite them to be a guest in my house	____	____	____
I would like to work with them at school	____	____	____
I would be friends with them	____	____	____
I would like to have them as a neighbor	____	____	____
I would not object to being related to them	____	____	____
I would accept them as a team captain	____	____	____
I would trust them with secrets	____	____	____
I would like them as a roommate	____	____	____
I would not mind eating in their house	____	____	____
I would participate with them in sports and games	____	____	____

Please indicate your opinion (Agree, Disagree, or No opinion) concerning the following statements:

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
95. To be Hispanic you need to speak Spanish.	____	____	____
96. Hispanics who don't know Spanish divide the community.	____	____	____
97. All Hispanics should also be able to speak English.	____	____	____
98. When I have children, I want them to be bilingual.	____	____	____

11

99. It is important to communicate in English at home.   ____   ____   ____

100. Spanish is changing because of contact with English.   ____   ____   ____

101. In what way(s) has Spanish changed? _____

_____

102. English is changing because of contact with Spanish.   ____   ____   ____

103. In what way(s) has English changed? _____

_____

104. It is important to me to speak Spanish.   ____   ____   ____

105. Hispanic young people in the US don't want
     to speak Spanish.   ____   ____   ____

106. Hispanic young people in the US don't know
     how to speak Spanish well.   ____   ____   ____

107. It is better to teach English to Hispanic children
     as early as possible.   ____   ____   ____

108. It is not good for children to learn two languages
     (Spanish and English) when they are still young.   ____   ____   ____

109. I believe that students would learn more effectively
     if they were taught in their mother tongue.   ____   ____   ____

110. A person who does not know how to speak Spanish
     can learn to speak it perfectly.   ____   ____   ____

111. My knowledge of English and ability to speak it fluently
     make me feel superior to those who don't know it.   ____   ____   ____

112. My knowledge of Spanish and ability to speak it fluently
     make me feel superior to those who don't know it.   ____   ____   ____

113. Hispanics should adopt foreign ways of life
     when they go abroad.   ____   ____   ____

114. American culture has destroyed Hispanic culture.   ____   ____   ____

115. Hispanics in the US have maintained
     their culture.   ____   ____   ____

116. Hispanics in the US have maintained Spanish.   ____   ____   ____

117. Hispanics in the US suffer discrimination.   ____   ____   ____

118. Hispanic in the US suffer discrimination
     because of language problems.   ____   ____   ____

119. Hispanics in the US are united.   ____   ____   ____

120. Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Are there any comments you would like to make about the questionnaire?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____