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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of Spanish-speaking English as a second language (ESL) students toward different varieties of Spanish. The students were asked to give their opinion of standard Spanish, Southwest Spanish, and Spanish-English code-switching.

One hundred and three ESL students at South Mountain Community College participated in this study. The respondents were male and female Mexicans representing different levels of English proficiency and varying also with respect to age, number of years lived in the U.S., and level of education completed in Mexico.

Three types of instruments were used for data collection. The first instrument was a questionnaire that elicited data on demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and years of residency in the U.S. The second instrument, which employed the Likert technique, consisted of nine items designed to elicit respondents’ attitudes toward the Spanish spoken in Phoenix (i.e., Southwest Spanish and Spanish-English code-switching) and the Spanish spoken in Mexico (i.e., standard Spanish). The third instrument, a listening exercise, was comprised of twelve pre-recorded sentences representative of the aforementioned varieties of Spanish. Respondents evaluated the sentences on a continuum ranging from “Educated” to “Extremely Unacceptable.”

The data was analyzed by tabulating frequency counts of responses on the language attitude questionnaire and on the listening exercise and comparing response
percentages (i.e., frequency count divided by total number of respondents) for each item.

The results of the data from both the language attitude questionnaire and the listening exercise revealed unfavorable attitudes toward Southwest Spanish and Spanish-English code-switching. Approximately three-fourths of the respondents perceived the Spanish spoken in Phoenix as being inferior to the Spanish spoken in Mexico City. Three-fourths of the respondents also did not think that code-switching sounded good. Reactions to the sentences in the listening exercise confirmed the results of the language attitude questionnaire: Southwest Spanish and code-switching were considered unacceptable.

Based on the findings of this research, it may be concluded that Mexicans residing in the U.S. have negative opinions of Southwest Spanish and Spanish-English code-switching. An unfavorable reaction toward Southwest Spanish may be based on one "glaring" deviation from the standard. Differences in perspectives between Mexicans and Mexican-Americans regarding the acceptability of Spanish constructions lead to negative attitudes on the part of Mexican speakers toward the Spanish of Mexican-Americans.

In view of these conclusions, a couple of recommendations are as follows: 1) In ESL classes that serve basically Spanish speakers, the teacher should help students develop an awareness of and appreciation for linguistic variety; and 2) In high schools and colleges that offer Spanish classes for native speakers, teachers should use reading and vocabulary development materials that incorporate different varieties of Spanish, including the standard form.
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CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Changes in language-use patterns among Spanish-speakers in the southwestern United States indicates a shift from Spanish to English (Floyd, 1985; Galindo, 1995; Spencer, 1995; Stephens, 1994). Even though many Mexican-Americans and Mexicans residing in the United States see Spanish as a symbol of culture and family and desire to maintain the language, language-use patterns indicate that language loss is taking place (Snipper, 1986).

According to Sanchez (1994), Mexican-Americans in the Southwest live under several contradictory conditions. Two of these involve language and culture. Sanchez (1994) says there is both language maintenance and language loss, and there is both acculturation and cultural resistance. Perhaps attitudes toward Southwest Spanish are factors in language use and maintenance.

Development of the Problem

Spencer (1995) claims that if people are made to feel ashamed of their variety of Spanish, chances are they will be compelled to switch to English faster and more completely. He describes the negative effect that can result when Spanish teachers and society at large look down on the Chicano’s use of local Spanish:
For generations, Hispanics in this country have been bombarded with negative propaganda concerning their language as well as their heritage. Spanish-speaking children have suffered corporal punishment for speaking their home language at school (Spencer, 1995). (p. 179)

In order to investigate the language attitudes of Spanish-speakers toward different varieties of Spanish it is important to start with a look at the characteristics of those varieties. Phonological and grammatical deviations from the standard are common in Southwest Spanish, which is one of three varieties of Spanish will be included in this study. Also important in this investigation are the findings of previous research on Spanish language use in the Southwest, including a discussion of language shift and maintenance, because there appears to be a correlation between patterns of language use and preservation of the language. Finally, the findings and conclusions of studies on language attitudes of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans toward Spanish will provide a point of reference for a discussion of this study's findings.

Need for the Study

Floyd (1985) examined the results of several studies on patterns of language use in different regions of the Southwest and found substantive evidence of language loss when, for example, children respond to their parents in English even when their parents speak to them in Spanish. If attitude is indeed a factor in language use and maintenance, more research is needed due to the following:
1. Attitudes toward Southwest Spanish tend to be negative in spite of these factors: a) the speaker of Southwest Spanish does not use exclusively a nonstandard variety, but rather a mixture of standard and nonstandard forms (Sanchez, 1994); b) Southwest Spanish is rule-governed (Sanchez, 1972); and c) the knowledge of different varieties and the ability to use them in appropriate social situations demonstrates sociolinguistic competence (Sanchez, 1994).

4. Phonological and grammatical deviations from the standard are common in Southwest Spanish. In what Penalosa (1980) calls “the most significant paper ever written on Chicano Spanish . . .” (p. 81), Sanchez (1972) did a linguistic analysis of the deviations found in the speech of 30 Mexican-American students at the University of Texas at Austin. She categorized the variant forms as phonological, morphological, syntactical, and lexical variations.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the language attitudes of Mexicans residing in the United States.

**Research Question**

The research questions is as follows: What are the attitudes of Spanish-speaking English as a second language (ESL) students at South Mountain Community College toward different varieties of Spanish?

**Definition of Terms**

*Acculturation:* The process of adapting to or borrowing traits from another culture (*The Random House College Dictionary*, 1980).

*Calo:* A variety of Spanish that consists of unique vocabulary, used predominantly by young male Chicanos for intragroup interaction (Penalosa, 1980).
Chicano: A person of Mexican ancestry who was born in and resides in the U.S. (The Random House College Dictionary, 1980).

Culture-conditioned switches: A shift from one language to another that is due to borrowing a lexical item to convey a culture-specific idea (Jacobson, 1977).

Cultural Resistance: Opposition to adapting to or borrowing traits from another culture (Sanchez, 1994).

Domain-sensitive Switch: A shift from one language to another that is due to each language being associated with certain activities or social situations (Jacobson, 1977).

Dominance-conditioned Switch: A shift from one language to another that is due to not knowing a word or phrase in the language being used at a given time (Jacobson, 1977).

Emotional Switch: A shift from one language to another that signals a change toward greater personal warmth in a relationship (Jacobson, 1977).

ESL Program: A program in which students whose native language is not English are taught to understand, speak, read, and write in English. In this study, the English as second language (ESL) program consists of four different levels with separate classes emphasizing the various language skills.

Ethnicity Marker: A shift from one language to another that is meant to demonstrate a bicultural heritage (Jacobson, 1977).

Grammatical Deviations: Variations from the standard rules of the grammatical structure of a language (Sanchez, 1972).
Language Attitudes: An evaluative reaction about the value of language varieties, in this case Spanish language varieties (Penalosa, 1980).

Language Loss: A gradual decrease in use of the language by succeeding generations (Penalosa, 1980).

Language Maintenance: Continued use of the language by succeeding generations (Penalosa, 1980).

Language Shift: See Language Loss.

Mexican: A native of Mexico residing in that country or in the U.S. (The Random House College Dictionary, 1980).

Mexican-American: See Chicano.

Rule-governed Behavior: A consistent and systematic application of rules in the use of variant forms (Sanchez, 1972).

Southwest Spanish: A variety of Spanish that consists of phonological, morphological, and syntactic deviations from standard Spanish (Penalosa, 1980).

Spanish-English Code-switching: The use of English and Spanish in alternating fashion. Code-switching can be defined as code-changing and code-mixing. Code-changing is a shifting of languages at the phrase or sentence level, whereas code-mixing is word level alternation. In this study, the code-switching consists of phrase level and word level alternation (McClure, 1977).

Standard Spanish: The Spanish spoken by the middle class in Mexico City (Garcia and Weller, 1985).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

An investigation of the language attitudes of Spanish-speaking adult ESL students toward different varieties of Spanish must first look at the characteristics of those varieties. A linguistic analysis, therefore, is presented here of variations from standard Spanish that are due to the influence from English and also that are due to the use of nonstandard forms. This is followed by a look at studies on Spanish language use in the Southwest which includes a discussion of language shift/maintenance and the idea of rule-governed behavior in Southwest Spanish. The final part of this literature review presents studies on language attitudes of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans toward Spanish. These language attitude studies are divided into the following main areas: attitudes toward Spanish vs. English and attitudes toward varieties of Spanish.

The Spanish Spoken in the Southwest

It is common knowledge that the Spanish of Mexican-Americans in general is different from the Spanish taught in Spanish classes in high schools, colleges, and universities (Spencer, 1995). However, rather than compare the Mexican-American’s Spanish to the Spanish prescribed by the Royal Spanish Academy, it might be better to compare it to standard Mexican Spanish. Standard Mexican Spanish is as reputable as
American English (Gaarder, 1977). It cannot be said that standard Mexican Spanish is inferior to Castilian Spanish anymore than it can be said that American English is inferior to British English.

**Influence from English**

It is quite apparent that English has influenced the phonology, grammar, and lexicon of Spanish in the Southwest. According to Sanchez (1994), borrowing from another language happens in all societies where two languages are in contact, especially when the source language is that of the dominant group. Craddock (1978) labels lexical borrowings from English to Spanish based on the process and manner of change. Words are classified, therefore, as assimilation, semantic displacement, and blending (p. 38).

Some assimilation words that involve phonetic adaptation of the English word include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crismes</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bisquete</td>
<td>biscuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daime</td>
<td>dime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some semantic displacement words that take a Spanish word that sounds like an English word and transfers the English meaning include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grocerias</th>
<th>groceries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>libreria</td>
<td>library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blending are similar to assimilation words in that there is phonetic adaptation of the English word, but there is the addition of a morphological unit from the Spanish language as well, for example:

suimear  to swim

cachar  to catch

tichar  to teach

According to Matlack and Mace (1973), the influence of English on Spanish is most notable in the area of lexicon and least evident in the area of phonology. Syntactic borrowings from English do not occur as much as lexical importations, but it is seen in studies by Lastra (1975) and Sanchez (1972). Lastra (1975) interviewed Mexican and Mexican-American children in kindergarten through fourth grade in East Los Angeles and found these examples of syntactic influence from English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorrect Syntax</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Correct Syntax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mi chiquito hermano</td>
<td>my little brother</td>
<td>mi hermano chiquito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimitri es no mas cuatro</td>
<td>Dimitri is only four</td>
<td>Dimitri tiene solamente cuatro anos de edad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se lo di pa’tras</td>
<td>I gave it back</td>
<td>se lo devolvi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanchez (1972) looked at Texas Spanish and found the following syntactic deviations that are the result of English “interference:”

Religion es algo muy personal  for  La religion es algo muy personal “Religion is something very personal”

El dinero que gana lo gasta en tomando  for  El dinero que gana lo gasta en tomar “The money he makes he spends on drinking”
No creo que es necesario for No creo que sea necesario “I don’t think it’s necessary”

Phonological differences from standard Spanish that can be explained in terms of English influence are few. Hidalgo (1988) looked at the data in various studies and mentions only two consonant changes that are due to English interference: a) labiodental pronunciation of bilabial fricative /b/ (e.g., [vaso]; and b) retroflex pronunciation of /r/ (e.g., [karta]).

The influence of English on morphology is even less common. Sanchez (1994) provides examples that are actually blends:

- weldear from weld
- mapiar from mop
- espelear from spell

Code-switching, or the use of two languages in alternating fashion, is widespread among Mexican-American bilinguals (Penalosa, 1980). Elias-Olivares (1976) states: “In general one could say that to be a bilingual means precisely to be able to switch rapidly from one language to another” (p. 13). Of course, this assumes competence in both languages. Asymmetrical bilinguals (i.e., more fluent in one language) may switch due to not knowing a word or phrase in the language they are using at a given time. Wald (1988) notes what happens when a sixteen-year-old, who is more fluent in English than Spanish, tries to give a spatial tour of a house in Spanish:

_Esta otra puerta ‘onde se -- enras a la -- a la recamara._ When you go in there, there’s -- (laughs) hay otros dos puertas de sliding. (laughs) I can’t talk! There’s another bedroom. _Otra recamara._ Then you go out . . . (p. 67)
Jacobson (1977) would call the above example a dominance-conditioned switch, and presents that as one of six reasons why Chicano English speakers switch to Spanish words or phrases. The other five reasons are: 1) ethnicity markers (andalu y pues), 2) domain-sensitive switches (chamacos), 3) emotional or intimacy switches, 4) culture- or language-conditioned switches (siesta, compadre), and 5) random switches (i.e., cannot categorize the switch as any of the above).

McClure (1977) examined 90 hours of speech samples obtained from 50 Mexican-American children, from 3 to 15 years of age, and found that their code-switching could be classified as code-changing and code-mixing. Code-changing involves a shifting of languages at the noun phrase, verb phrase, or sentence level, that is, at the level of major sentence constituents. Code-mixing is word-level alternation.

In McClure’s (1977) study, there were over 500 code-changes, yet only 30 involved phrase level changes. Therefore, overwhelmingly there was language alternation at the sentence level. McClure (1977) attributes this to the bilingual capabilities of the children in the sample, as it seems that code-changing at the phrase level is dependent on the speaker’s competence in both languages. Also, neither sentence level nor phrase level alternation was seen much in younger informants.

The younger children in McClure’s (1977) study tended to code-mix rather than code-change, because of not being able to access the word in the language of discourse, for example,

I put the tenedores on the table  for  I put the forks on the table

I want a motorcycle verde.  for  I want a green motorcycle
However, Lance (1975) does not agree that not being able to think of the word in the language of discourse is the primary reason for word-level switching. According to Lance, stylistic factors (to emphasize, focus, elaborate, clarify, attract/retain attention, shift topic, shift addressee), not bilingual competence, are the reasons for word level switching. To support this he gives the example of an 11-year old in his study who describes a baseball game. The boy used **carreras** as well as runs, **batear** as well as bat, **ganaron** as well as beat, etc., using both languages to give an account of the game.

**Nonstandard Forms**

There are linguistic deviations from standard Spanish in the speech of Mexican-American bilinguals that are not due to influence or borrowing from English. It is noteworthy that the archaisms, metathesis, and Mexicanisms that are found in Chicano Spanish can also be found in other parts of the world (Wald, 1988). Therefore, these departures from the norm are not typical of Southwest Spanish only.

**Archaism**s. Words such as **semos** in lieu of **somos**, **asina** in lieu of **asi**, **truje** in lieu of **traje**, **vide** in lieu of **vi**, **naiden** in lieu of **nadie**, and **haiga** in lieu of **haya** were found in the Spanish of Mexican American college students at the University of Texas in Austin (Sanchez, 1972). These examples of archaic forms are retentions from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and, therefore, are not peculiar to that period of time only. Moreover, because archaic forms were transported to the Southwest by early Mexican and Spanish settlers, these words are found not only in Southwest Spanish but throughout the Spanish-speaking world. Archaisms are more prevalent in New Mexico, especially because the area has had the least influx of immigrants from Mexico in recent
years. Immigrants tend to bring with them changes that are taking place in the language as it evolves.

**Metathesis.** Metathesis involves the transposing of sounds in certain words. In his analysis of Los Angeles Spanish, Phillips (1967) elicited a group of words from 31 adults varying in terms of sex, age, social rank, and use of English and Spanish. He used conversational data, as well, to supplement the elicited language. A switch in order of sounds was found involving two phonemes in particular: /u/ when not syllabic and /r/:

- ciudad  >  /suidad/
- deuda  >  /dedua/
- pierda  >  /piedra/

**Mexicanisms.** Mexicanisms are words that originated in Nahuatl, the language of the Aztecs. There are hundreds of these words in Mexican Spanish that were borrowed from Nahuatl (Penalosa, 1980) and many of these later were incorporated from Spanish to English, for example coyote and chocolate. The following are examples from Santamaria’s (1974) *Diccionario de Mejicanismos*:

- elote  (corn on the cob)
- guacamole  (avocado dip)
- chamaco  (boy)
- chulo  (handsome)

**Spanish Language Use in the Southwest**

It appears that the Spanish language is alive and well in the southwestern part of the United States. This stands to reason in view of the following: the Southwest was at
one time Mexican territory; immigration from Mexico to the U.S., both legal and undocumented, is high; a good number of Mexican-Americans have contact with relatives in Mexico; and Mexican movies and television programs have been widely disseminated in the U.S. through Spanish language television networks. In 1994, Sanchez predicted that by the end of this century, Hispanics will be the largest minority in the U.S., and possibly the majority population in states like California. Elias-Olivares, Leone, Cisneros, and Gutierrez (1985) stated that the large population of Hispanics in the U.S. made it the fourth largest Spanish-speaking country in the world, after Mexico, Spain, and Colombia.

Add to this the fact that a large segment of the Hispanic population in the southwestern U.S. is first, second, and third generation, and it is expected that Spanish will continue to survive among Mexican-Americans. Wald's (1988) research in East Los Angeles shows that age on arrival in the U.S. determines the degree to which Spanish-speakers will continue to prefer their native language. Spanish maintenance is favored by first generation, working class Mexican Americans who arrive at the age of 15 or older. Wald (1988) calls them late arrivals, distinguishing them from those who arrive as children (early arrivals) and those who are born in the U.S. (later generations).

A desire to learn and use the second language, English, and thus become bilingual is seen in three groups that Wald (1988) identifies as follows:

a. early arrivals of the first generation

b. second generation

c. split generation (one parent is of the first generation and the other is of a later generation)
Floyd (1985) believes that the question of whether Spanish is being maintained or lost cannot be answered conclusively due to the limited number of studies on the subject and thus the assumption that Spanish continues to be maintained is simply a supposition—not based on systematic investigations of patterns of language use. Floyd (1985) examined the findings of several studies on patterns of language use in different regions of the Southwest: Texas, New Mexico, California, and Colorado. She noted patterns of language use in correlation with such factors as generation, age, and level of education.

One of the earliest studies that Floyd (1985) examined, done in 1970, showed the least amount of shift from Spanish to English. However, even these respondents, from both rural and urban areas in south Texas, demonstrated language loss in that the younger children used Spanish less than the older children, who in turn used the native language less than their parents.

The other studies reviewed by Floyd (1985) on the subject of patterns of language use showed more substantive evidence of language loss. For example, in a Mexican-American area of Austin in 1974, proof that Spanish was giving way to English in the home, was seen in that 60 percent of the children of second-generation families used only English even when their parents spoke to them in Spanish. A clear indication of language loss is evident also in a 1978 study of Chicano married women in Los Angeles in which 84 percent of first-generation respondents continued to use primarily Spanish and 84 percent of the third generation used mostly English. In Northern New Mexico, in what was basically a monolingual Spanish community in 1940, the shift to bilingualism was apparent in a 1975 study in which children used equal amounts of English and Spanish at
home with siblings even though they used mostly Spanish with their parents. Colorado informants in 1982 reported that while 62 percent of their parents used some or all Spanish with each other at home, 74 percent of their mothers and 75 percent of their fathers preferred to used only English with their children at home.

Floyd's (1985) review of the literature on language use patterns indicates that the family setting is no longer the domain of the Spanish language among Chicanos in the Southwest. Because linguistic patterns are shifting in favor of English language use in the home, it can be said that language loss, not maintenance, is in process. According to Penalosa (1980), the family is the most important factor in promoting the culture and, thus, the language, which is a crucial element of culture.

While it could be supposed that if both languages are being used in the home, which was the case in the studies that Floyd (1985) examined, it follows that Spanish is not being abandoned. However, as Stephens (1994) suggests, the idea that a big majority of Mexican Americans are "more or less bilingual ...does not bode well for the continued good health of the Spanish language use among U.S. Hispanic Americans (p. 5)." Stephens (1994) proposes that as long as Spanish and English have separate functions (i.e., used in different social settings), the minority language, in this case Spanish, will survive and cites examples of bilingual situations where the minority language was used alongside the majority language in the same domains and was eventually lost: Welsh and Scottish in Great Britain and Pennsylvania Dutch in the U.S.
Standard vs. Local Spanish

One influence on language use patterns, and thus maintenance of the native language, is the majority group's attitude toward language variety. Spencer (1995) describes the negative effect that can result when Spanish teachers and society at large look down on the Chicano's use of local Spanish:

It is not uncommon for native speakers to resist enrolling in a Spanish for Native Speakers course. They often seek out the beginning levels of a Spanish foreign language class in order to "learn it right." For generations, Hispanics in this country have been bombarded with negative propaganda concerning their language as well as their heritage. Spanish-speaking children have suffered corporal punishment for speaking their home language at school; yet as adults they are ridiculed for the informal and illiterate nature of their Spanish. (p. 179)

If a student is made to feel ashamed of his variety of Spanish, chances are he will be compelled to switch to English faster and more completely, since he does not see much use for the standard variety outside of school. The idea of offering Spanish classes for native speakers has become more common in high schools, colleges, and universities in recent years. Unfortunately, some teachers have seen this as a call to eradicate the students' native dialect, as was the case in the 1960s when teaching standard English to Black English speakers focused on correcting their inferior English (Faltis, 1984).

Spencer (1995) recommends that Spanish for native speakers programs use reading and vocabulary development materials that incorporate different varieties of Spanish, including, of course, the standard form. Therefore, rather than working at eradicating the students' poor language habits, the emphasis is on literacy. As the students are exposed to readings that are at their level in terms of interest and skill, they will have the opportunity to compare the differences between their own dialect and the standard dialect. They will thus acquire a new variety of Spanish without rejecting their
own local variety. This serves two purposes: They will maintain their native language and will, by adding another variety (standard Spanish), be able to function in the Spanishspeaking world at large.

**Chicano Spanish: Rule-Governed Behavior**

Sanchez (1994) notes that the speaker of Southwest Spanish does not use exclusively nonstandard forms, but rather a mixture of standard and nonstandard elements. In what might be, according to Penalosa (1980), “the most significant paper ever written on Chicano Spanish . . . (p. 81)” Sanchez (1972) did a linguistic analysis of the deviations found in the speech of 30 Mexican-American students at the University of Texas at Austin. The following are a few of the variant forms and a brief explanation of rule-governed behavior:

**Phonological variations:**

1. Aphaeresis (loss of initial sound or syllable): ayudar becomes yudar.
2. Syneresis (diphthongization of vowels in hiatus): traer become trai.
3. Reduction of diphthongs in accented syllables: paciencia becomes pacencia.
4. Laxing of unstressed vowels: policia become polecia.
5. Apocopation (loss of final syllable): clase becomes clas.
6. Reduction of homologous vowels: leer becomes ler.
7. Syncope (loss of sound or syllable from the middle of a word): zanahoria become zanoria.

**Morphological variations:**

2. Thematic vowel changes based on another tense (e.g., preterite): tenía becomes tuvía.

3. Vowel rise in the stem simultaneous with lowering of thematic vowel: venimos becomes vinemos.


5. Over-regularization of irregular past participles: abierta becomes abrido.


8. Addition of final –s to the preterite second person singular (by analogy with all the other tenses): fuiste becomes fuistes.

Syntactical variations:

1. Reduction of nos to no when followed by an enclitic or proclitic pronoun: Vendanoslo becomes Vendanolos.

2. Reduction of interrogative pronouns to the singular form (due possibly to English transfer): Quiénes son? becomes Quién son?

3. Use of que for lo que (due to English transfer): Es todo lo que puedo decir . . . becomes Es todo que puedo decir . . .

4. Change of gender (from masculine to feminine) of nouns that end in –a: el sistema becomes la sistema.

5. Lack of gender and noun agreement: las escuelas becomes los escuelas.

Lexical variations:

1. Use of archaic forms: nadie becomes nadien.

2. Transfer of English meaning to Spanish cognates: biblioteca becomes librería (from library).

3. Transfer of English phonology and morphology to Spanish cognates: distinto becomes distintó.
4. Borrowing from English to Spanish:
   
a. When the English word ends in \(-\text{er}\), it terminates in \(-\text{a}\) in Spanish: \text{regla} becomes \text{rula}.

b. Verbs take the \(-\text{er}\) ending as opposed to the \(-\text{ir}\) or \(-\text{er}\), more common is the \(-\text{ear}\) ending, which very often is reduced to \(-\text{iar}\): \text{errar} becomes \text{mistear/mistiar} (from \text{miss}).

c. Borrowed words ending in a consonant (other than \(d, l, r, n, \) or \(s\)) generally terminate in a vowel (\(-e\) being the most common): \text{empuje} becomes \text{puche} (from \text{push}).

The above analysis of the structural characteristics of Chicano Spanish demonstrates the rule-governed nature of this variety.

Language Attitudes of Mexicans and Mexican Americans toward Spanish

It was noted in the previous section of this chapter that changes in language use patterns indicate a shift from Spanish to English. Sanchez (1994) asserts that Chicanos in the Southwest live under several contradictory conditions. Two of these involve language and culture. Sanchez (1994) says there is both language maintenance and language loss, and there is both acculturation and cultural resistance.

Contradictions in the attitudes of Hispanics toward retention of the language and culture are in fact seen in two different studies, one done in Los Angeles and the other in Laredo, Texas. The Los Angeles study by Snipper (1986) examined the attitudes of parents of limited English proficient (LEP) students toward native language retention. The forty-four respondents, mostly female, ranging in age from 26 to 40, were born in Mexico and had resided in the United States for six to ten years. A strong desire to maintain Spanish was indicated by the parents. While they recognized the importance of
English as a means of upward mobility, they viewed retention of Spanish as a way to preserve the culture and traditions of the home. Furthermore, the parents expressed the belief that their children would get better jobs if they were bilingual. Most reported that their children used both English and Spanish at home, even though the parents spoke Spanish with their children at home. This linguistic situation signals transitional bilingualism according to Stephens (1994). If both languages are used in the same domain, in this case the home, one will eventually replace the other. Because English is associated with social and economic advancement, it would be the favored language (Sanchez, 1994).

Galindo (1996) presents a different view in a study of language attitudes of ten Hispanic women in Laredo, Texas. Nine were elementary education majors and one was a special education teacher. Eight were born in the U.S. and two were born in Mexico. Their reactions to the idea of bilingual education classes and the use of both languages to teach Spanish dominant children were basically negative. One woman commented: “English is more prestigious . . . The kids should be drilled in English. They don’t need Spanish, they’re not in Mexico” (p. 8). Galindo (1996) points out that monolingual Spanish-speaking parents are sometimes the most vocal about their opposition to classes for their children that promote the use of Spanish.

In her interviews of three Chicano university students on their attitudes toward Spanish, Sanchez (1994) obtained varied evaluations. One was a female undergraduate student from Northern California who expressed remorse about rejecting the language of her parents when she was younger. Currently, she sees Spanish as a symbol of culture and family and desires to regain proficiency in the language. Another student is a male
university senior from San Antonio who speaks a nonstandard variety of Spanish, but is proud of the fact that he can use the Spanish language at all. He code-switches constantly and is aware that negative feelings abound concerning his way of speaking; nonetheless, he considers his varieties of Spanish a new and better way for the younger generation of Chicanos to express themselves. He is determined not to let “el sistema” stop him from using Spanish. The third student is a male graduate student at UCSD whose parents are from New Mexico. Although Spanish was his first language, it is no longer his dominant language and uses it only in greetings and leave-taking when speaking with other Chicanos, in others words, as a cultural marker. He prefers to use English, which he feels more comfortable with and has made no attempt to improve his Spanish language proficiency by taking classes. Sanchez suggests that this is the position of many Chicanos who view Spanish as the language of low-income, poorly educated persons. A good command of English, on the other hand, is associated with opportunities for upward mobility.

If a person’s attitude toward Spanish is that it is important for communication purposes, chances are that person will remain bilingual (Mejia, 1988). Mejia (1988) looked at the language attitudes of 293 Mexican-American university students and professionals in the Rio Grande Valley of South Texas. Each informant was given a list of twelve reasons why Mexican-Americans use Spanish and were asked to select the three most important reasons they personally used the language. The twelve reasons included three of each of four dimensions of attitude: communicative (e.g., “I use Spanish because it is necessary for daily communication.”); instrumental (e.g., “I use Spanish because it helps me make more money at my job.”); sentimental (e.g., “I use
Spanish to feel good about myself.”); and value (e.g., “I use Spanish to keep my traditional values.”) The top two choices were communication items, with 66.3 percent selecting “I use Spanish to get along with my parents, relatives, and friends” and 65.7 percent choosing “I use Spanish because it is necessary for daily communication.” The third choice was a value reason which was selected by 32.3 percent. Clearly, among the four attitude dimensions, the use of Spanish for communication is the strongest, and not only with regard to the family (i.e., home) domain but also with regard to the public domain. Mejia (1988) considers this a sign of language maintenance. Others might disagree, citing that if both English and Spanish are used in the public domain, the majority language will prevail. In this case, however, an important factor is that 80 percent of the population in the Rio Grande Valley is Mexican-American with varying degrees of bilingualism.

**Spanish vs. English**

In a review of the literature on language attitudes among Spanish speakers, Galindo (1995) points out the change in research methodology. Whereas prior to the mid-seventies, language attitudes research was tied to psychology and limited to an educational setting, the 1970s and 1980s saw a change to a sociolinguistic model.

One of the first studies that employed this new model was done by Elias-Olivares (1976) in East Austin. She did not use the matched-guise method of measuring language attitudes which was commonly used in earlier studies to elicit attitudes toward language and the speakers of those languages. (Matched-guise is a technique in which the same speakers use different languages or varieties. Thinking that they are listening to a
different speaker each time, the subjects are supposedly reacting to the language or variety, not to the characteristics of the speaker’s voice.) Elias-Olivares (1976) used interviewing as a means of gathering information on language use and language attitudes. While this method of gathering data can be an inconvenience in terms of processing and recording the data (especially if the sample is large), it works favorably in that it enables the interviewer to direct the subject’s attention toward a specific point, thus getting more accurate responses.

The subjects were 92 first-, second-, and third-generation Chicanos of varying degrees of fluency in English and Spanish. In her conversations with them and through a survey interview, Elias-Olivares (1976) discovered that English was preferred over Spanish, especially among second and third-generation speakers. While Spanish was seen as important for use in the home and in the barrio, English was seen as the language of upward mobility, and, therefore, for reasons of personal benefit and practicality, was viewed more favorably. It is interesting to note that the more positive attitude toward Spanish came from those who already have achieved social and economic status.

Another study of Austin Chicanos’ language attitudes was conducted almost twenty years later by Galindo (1995), an admirer of the work done by Elias-Olivares, with its methods of analysis based on sociolinguistic theory. A total of 30 teenagers (15 females and 15 males) ranging in age from 14 to 19, were asked questions such as “How would you describe the type of Spanish spoken in this area?” “Would you encourage or discourage your children to speak Spanish?” “Do you consider your English to be equal to, better, or worse than your Anglo peers?” More females than males expressed preferences for Spanish or both Spanish and English. English dominant males in general
expressed negative views of Spanish and its speakers. Apparently, resentment toward Mexican immigrants along with feelings of superiority have caused many Chicano youths to use language as a means to set themselves apart from the rising number of immigrants in the barrios of Austin. They have chosen English as their only means of communication while at the same time putting down the Spanish language and those who speak it. Galindo (1995) foresees continuing immigration from Mexico as a factor in language shift from Spanish to English among younger Chicanos unless relations between Chicanos and Mexicans improve and parents make a conscious effort to pass on the Spanish language to their children. There were some inconsistencies in the information provided by some informants who apparently had negative feelings about Spanish, yet they felt a strong desire to preserve the language as a symbol of their Mexican heritage and identity.

Varieties of Spanish

It is important, when investigating language attitudes, that Mexican-American Spanish be viewed as a continuum of Spanish varieties, including standard and local codes (Sanchez, 1994). Furthermore, Sanchez claims, the speakers possess not just one variety but several varieties, and, depending on who they are talking to, what they are talking about, and other factors, they can shift from one mode of expression to another. Nonetheless, negative attitudes toward Mexican-American Spanish are prevalent. Chicanos as well as Mexicans have a tendency to view Chicano Spanish negatively.
Garcia and Weller (1985) conducted a survey to find out what Mexicans in Mexico City and Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles consider acceptable Spanish and unacceptable Spanish. Twenty-five sentences ranging from very educated speech to very colloquial, uneducated speech were presented to 76 Mexican subjects representing both the professional and working classes and 38 Mexican-American college students. After listening to the sentences on tape, the subjects evaluated each one in terms of acceptability. The same sentences were then presented in written form and the subjects were asked to underline and change anything they thought was incorrect to what they thought it should be.

For example, the colloquial sentence *Anduve buscandolo pa’arriba y pa’abajo todo el día* ("I was looking for him all over the place all day") was changed by everyone in the Mexican group to a more "correct" form. The correct written form is *Lo busqué por todos lados durante todo el día*. Among the Mexican-American subjects, only 45 percent eliminated or replaced the colloquial expression *pa’arriba y pa’abajo*, while 26 percent simply changed *pa’* to *para*. The rest in this group made no changes. In their analysis of the data, Garcia and Weller (1985) noted several areas where the Mexican and Mexican-American subjects disagreed on the acceptability of Spanish constructions. The authors suggest that these differences in linguistic norms may lead to negative attitudes on the part of Mexican speakers toward the speech of Mexican-Americans.

It might be expected that Mexicans who live on the U.S.-Mexican border, and thus in closer proximity to Mexican-Americans, would be more tolerant and accepting of Mexican-American Spanish. Hidalgo (1986) found this not to be the case. She interviewed 45 males and 40 females, residents of Juarez, in order to test several
hypotheses about language loyalty and language prejudice. The interviewees, all employed in stable jobs and representing a range of socio-economic backgrounds, expressed a strong dislike for the mixture of English and Spanish, which they see as typical in the speech of Mexican-Americans in El Paso. However, while 51 percent of the respondents denied that language mixture takes place in Juarez or that they as individual speakers mix the two languages, close to half (47%) stated that they, as individual speakers did mix Spanish with English.

With regard to the subjects’ perception of their own variety of Spanish compared to the Spanish spoken in Mexico City, there was a definite feeling that the variety of Spanish spoken in the Mexican capital is more acceptable and correct that the Spanish spoken in Juarez. According to Hidalgo (1986), Mexicans from the interior would concur, as Mexican border residents have been the target of criticism with regard to language habits and conduct in general.

If Mexicans in the interior of the country (e.g., Mexico City) disapprove of the Spanish spoken by Mexican border residents and the Spanish of Mexican-Americans, and, in turn, border residents look down on the Spanish of Mexican Americans, what is the attitude of Mexican-Americans toward different Spanish varieties? Galindo’s 1996 study of the language attitudes of ten Hispanic women in Laredo, Texas, looked at their reactions toward three Spanish varieties: standard Spanish, border Spanish (including code-switching), and calo. Their description of standard Spanish included the following: "correct" and "formal," used by people with better education and higher social class; no mixing with English; and based on Mexico City and Nuevo Laredo (across the border from Laredo) Spanish. Border Spanish was characterized as follows: a mixture of
Spanish and English; contains borrowings from English such as *lonche*, *bisquete*, *parquear*; and broken Spanish that begins in one language and changes to another. A description of calo included the following: a type of slang used in Laredo barrios by very poor people; not educated Spanish; unique vocabulary such as *filas* (knives), *canton* (house). When asked to evaluate their own variety of Spanish, there was a range of perceptions, from self-confidence in their Spanish-speaking abilities to insecurity. Those who expressed a lack of confidence in their Spanish described it as they had described border Spanish—“broken” and not as correct as the variety spoken in Mexico.

Summary

There appears to be a change in language use patterns among Mexicans and Mexican Americans in the Southwest. The limited number of studies on the subject of Spanish language use patterns and native language maintenance supports the idea that language loss is taking place.

Spencer (1995) claims that if a person is made to feel ashamed of his variety of Spanish, chances are he will be compelled to switch to English faster and more completely. This idea calls for more investigation due to the following:

1. Attitudes toward Southwest Spanish tend to be negative in spite of these factors: a) the speaker of Southwest Spanish does not use only nonstandard forms, but rather a mixture of standard and nonstandard; b) Southwest Spanish is rule-governed; and c) the knowledge of different varieties and the ability to use them in appropriate social situations demonstrates sociolinguistic competence.

2. Phonological and grammatical deviations from the standard are common in Southwest Spanish.
3. Attitudes toward language variety are a factor in language use and maintenance.

Very few studies have examined the attitudes of Mexican Americans toward varieties of Spanish. Even fewer have looked at the language attitudes of Mexicans residing in the United States. That is the purpose of this research.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the language attitudes of Mexicans residing in the United States. The specific research question is: What are the attitudes of Spanish-speaking, English as a second language (ESL) students at South Mountain Community College toward different varieties of Spanish?

Research Design

This study used the descriptive method of research to gather three types of data: demographic characteristics, language attitudes, and judgments about the spoken language. This allowed the researcher to examine the respondents’ opinions and attitudes, which is the primary focus of descriptive research. All responses were confidential.

The demographic data (e.g., gender, age, education, English proficiency, years of residency in the U.S.) are necessary in order to study the effects of demographic characteristics on language attitudes (Appendix A).

The language attitudes data (Appendix B) served to measure the attitudes of Mexicans toward standard Spanish, Southwest Spanish, and Spanish-English code-
switching. Nine statements were presented. Respondents were asked to mark one of five Likert scale responses for each sentence, ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” This type of attitude scale yields a score that can be used to compare individuals. Favorable or unfavorable perceptions of Spanish varieties might be dependent upon demographic characteristics of respondents (e.g., age, gender, etc.) (Appendix B).

To measure respondents’ awareness of what is acceptable Spanish and unacceptable Spanish, they were asked to react on a Likert scale to tape-recorded, spoken sentences. They marked one of five responses ranging from “Educated Spanish” to “Extremely Unacceptable Spanish.” This listening exercise served as an additional measure of language attitudes (Appendix C).

**Population and Sample**

A sample of 103 students from Mexico who were enrolled in the grammar classes in the ESL program at South Mountain Community College was used for this study. There are four day classes and six evening classes. Instructors were sent a memo asking if they would be willing to have their students participate in this study. Eight classes volunteered. The ESL program offers four levels of grammar: low beginning, high beginning, low intermediate, and high intermediate. There were 103 total responses to the three questionnaires.
Assumptions and Limitations

Some assumptions are as follows:

1. The attitude assessment instrument is a valid means of measuring language attitudes. Hidalgo (1986) used this data-gathering technique in a study of attitudes toward correctness of Spanish spoken in Mexico City, Juarez, and El Paso.

2. Respondents will understand the purpose of the listening exercise—the idea of evaluating the acceptability of a variety of Spanish, not the content of the sentences and not the characteristics of the speaker’s voice. This study will use a technique used by Garcia and Weller (1985) to get at opinions of what is and is not acceptable Spanish. Garcia and Weller (1985) rejected the matched-guise technique which was common in language attitudes research prior to the mid-seventies. The matched-guise technique elicits attitudes about the speaker, which is not the goal of this study.

3. Mexicans who live in the U.S., and thus in close proximity to Mexican-Americans will be more tolerant and accepting of Southwest Spanish and code-switching.

Limitations are as follows:

1. The sample was restricted to the number of ESL classes that agreed to participate in the study. Eight of ten classes agreed to participate.

2. Attitude is defined in terms of evaluative reaction.

The instruments used in this study elicited the respondents’ feelings and opinions about varieties of Spanish, thus dealing only with the affective component and not the behavioral component of attitudes.
Procedure

The third week of April, the researcher visited each of the eight ESL classes to administer to whole-class groups the demographic data questionnaire, the attitude measure, and the listening exercise. The study targeted Mexican students, who comprised about 95% of the enrollment in the ESL program at South Mountain Community College. Non-Mexican students were dismissed. Respondents were given a brief description of the research project and its purpose. Precise instructions were given in Spanish at the beginning of each of the three parts of the data collection process. It was expected that the demographic data questionnaire would take about five minutes to complete, the attitude measure also about five minutes, and the listening exercise about twelve minutes. Respondents listened to a total of 12 sentences with enough pause time after each one to allow the respondent to circle the number that best described his/her opinion.

Instrumentation

Three types of instruments will be used for data collection in this study. The first instrument is a researcher-designed questionnaire that elicits data on demographic characteristics such as gender, age, education, English proficiency, years of residency in the U.S., and occupation (Appendix A).

The second instrument is a variation of a questionnaire used by Hidalgo (1986) that employs the Likert technique. It is comprised of nine items such as “The Spanish spoken in Phoenix is more correct than that spoken in Mexico,” “Mexican-Americans from Phoenix should imitate Mexicans from Mexico when they speak Spanish,” and “It
bothers me when Mexican-Americans from Phoenix talk English and Spanish at the same
time” (Appendix B).

The listening exercise is based on a technique used by Garcia and Weller (1985)
and consists of twelve tape-recorded sentences spoken by a native Spanish speaker.
The sentences were selected from spoken Spanish data collected by Sanchez (1994) and
Garcia and Weller (1985) and are representative of the following three varieties of
Spanish: (1) standard Spanish (spoken by the “middle class” in Mexico City); (2)
southwest Spanish (a variety of Spanish that has phonological, morphological, and
syntactic deviations from the standard); and (3) Spanish-English code-switching (phrase
level and word level alternation of English and Spanish). A response sheet was provided
for respondents to mark one of five responses on a continuum ranging from “Educated”
to “Extremely Unacceptable” (Appendix C).

Method of Analysis

The language attitudes of respondents were analyzed by tabulating frequency
counts of responses on the language attitudes questionnaire and comparing response
percentages (i.e., frequency count divided by total number of respondents) for each item.
Data is presented in tables.

Reactions to language were also analyzed by tabulating frequency counts of
responses on the listening exercise and comparing response percentages for each item.
Data is presented in tables.

A comparison of the data yielded by the above attitude measures will allow the
researcher to see if there is any contradictory pattern of attitudes. For example, if on the
language attitudes questionnaire, respondents indicate unfavorable perceptions of Mexican American Spanish, it would follow that the spoken sentences in the listening exercise that represent this variety of Spanish would be judged as unacceptable.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study examined the attitudes of Spanish-speaking English as a second language (ESL) students at South Mountain Community College toward three Spanish varieties: standard Spanish, Southwest Spanish, and Spanish-English code-switching.

Demographics

A questionnaire to obtain demographic data was administered to 103 students in eight ESL classes at SMCC. There were more females (n=63) than males (n=40). Seventy-five percent of the respondents ranged in age from 18 to 34. Twenty-five percent were 35 and over. Respondents were found to be in all levels of English proficiency (low beginning to high intermediate). With regard to level of education completed in Mexico, the majority completed at least high school (41.6%) or preparatory school (25.7%). Nearly forty-one percent of all respondents have lived in the U.S. up to five years. Table 1 shows demographic data about the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Respondents n=103</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Sample</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-34</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Proficiency:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low beginning</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High beginning</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low intermediate</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High intermediate</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Education Completed in Mexico:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Lived in the U.S.:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings and Results

Attitudinal data was gathered using a variation of a questionnaire used by Hidalgo (1986) that employs the Likert technique. There were nine items designed to elicit respondents’ opinions about the Spanish spoken in Phoenix (i.e., Southwest Spanish and Spanish-English code-switching) and the Spanish spoken in Mexico.

Table 2 indicates that 26.2 percent of the respondents rated the Spanish spoken in Phoenix and Mexican border towns as being the same (Item 1), while 31.1 percent agreed and 13.6 percent strongly agreed that the Spanish spoken in border towns is more correct than that spoken in Phoenix. Items 1 and 3 are the same but in reverse form, yet the results were not the same. It is difficult to offer an explanation for this.

Half of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed (29.4% and 19.6%, respectively) that the Spanish of Mexico City is more correct than that of border towns (Item 2). One-third (34.3%), however, disagreed with that statement.

With respect to Item 4, 43.7 percent of the respondents disagreed and 34.0 percent strongly disagreed that the Spanish spoken in Phoenix is more correct than the Spanish of Mexico City. A comparison of the data for Items 1 and 4 shows that Phoenix Spanish is perceived as being more inferior to Mexico City Spanish than to border Spanish.
### Table 2. Response Percentages: Attitudes toward Southwest Versus Standard Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Spanish spoken in Mexican border towns is more correct than that spoken in Phoenix.</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Spanish spoken in Mexico City is more correct than that spoken in Mexican border towns.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Spanish spoken in Phoenix is more correct than that spoken in Mexican border towns.</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Spanish spoken in Phoenix is more correct than that spoken in Mexico City.</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly disagree; 4 = Disagree; 3 = They are the same; 2 = Agree; 1 = Strongly agree

The findings for Item 1 in Table 3 reveal that the majority of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed (39.8% and 21.4%, respectively) that Mexican Americans should imitate the Mexicans from Mexico when they speak Spanish. Perhaps respondents were reacting in part to the tendency among Mexican Americans to codeswitch. Items 2, 3, and 5 in Table 3 focus specifically on Spanish-English codeswitching, and the results show that this variety of Spanish is looked upon negatively.

Three-fourths of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (35% and 39.8%, respectively) with the statement that code-switching sounds good (Item 2).
Table 3. Response Percentages: Attitudes toward Code-switching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mexican Americans from Phoenix should imitate the Mexicans from Mexico when they speak Spanish.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It sounds good when Mexican Americans from Phoenix change from Spanish to English and from English to Spanish in the same sentence.</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is impossible to understand what Mexican Americans from Phoenix say when they mix the two languages.</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I speak correct Spanish.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I want my children to know how to speak mixing the two languages.</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly disagree; 4 = Disagree; 3 = Uncertain; 2 = Agree; 1 = Strongly agree

Almost equal numbers of participants responded negatively and affirmatively (44% and 42%, respectively) to the statement about it being impossible to understand code-switching (Item 3). Almost three-fourths disagreed or strongly disagreed (30% and 43%, respectively) with the statement that they want their children to know how to speak mixing the two languages (Item 5).

Item 4 was included in order to get an idea of how respondents perceive their own ability to speak “correct” Spanish. It is interesting to note that 30 percent were not sure
whether they speak “correct” Spanish, while 27 percent agreed and 32 percent strongly agreed that they do so.

The listening exercise, based on a technique used by Garcia and Weller (1985), was used to explore opinions of what is and is not acceptable Spanish. Twelve pre-recorded sentences, representative of standard Spanish, Southwest Spanish, and Spanish-English code-switching, were evaluated by the respondents on a continuum ranging from “Educated” to “Extremely Unacceptable.” (See Appendix C for transcript of sentences.)

Sentences 1, 6, and 10 (Appendix C) were categorized by Garcia and Weller (1985) as standard Spanish. Sentence 3 was considered by them to be working class Mexican Spanish and, as such, was not be included in any category (i.e., standard, Southwest, or code-switching) for data analysis. Sentences 2, 5, 8, and 11 (Appendix C) were classified by Sanchez (1994) as Southwest Spanish, and sentences 4, 7, 9, and 12 (Appendix C) were classified as code-switching.

For the sake of clarity in the presentation of the findings for the listening exercise, the five response categories were collapsed into two general categories in the reporting of response percentages: “Educated,” “Correct,” and “Popular Acceptable” will be considered favorable opinions and “Popular Unacceptable” and “Extremely Unacceptable” will be considered unfavorable opinions.

According to Table 4, the standard Spanish items were viewed as “Acceptable,” “Correct,” or “Educated,” with 79 percent, 95 percent, and 97 percent for sentences 1, 6, and 10, respectively. Sentence 1 was not seen as “Educated” and “Correct” by more
Table 4. Response Percentages: The Acceptability of Spoken Spanish Sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Educated; 4 = Correct; 3 = Popular acceptable; 2 = Popular unacceptable; 1 = Extremely unacceptable.

Respondents in view of the fact that the sentence uses an expression that is considered superstandard by Garcia and Weller (1985).

Respondents' reaction to the Southwest Spanish items (i.e., sentences 2, 5, 8, and 9) produced mixed results (i.e., not consistently favorable or unfavorable for that variety of Spanish). Sentence 2 received “Unacceptable” and “Extremely Unacceptable” ratings
of 96 percent and sentence 8 obtained 88 percent in those two categories. On the contrary, sentence 5, “Tuvimos un buen tiempo,” was viewed favorably with 93 percent calling it “Educated,” “Correct,” and “Acceptable” Spanish, even though the sentence reflects English interference. The correct standard form would be “Pasamos un buen tiempo.” Sentence 11 was perceived as “Unacceptable” and “Extremely Unacceptable” by 61 percent of the respondents; however, 28 percent thought it was “Acceptable.” Perhaps some who viewed it as “Acceptable” thought they heard nos instead of the nonstandard los in “Mi maestra los enseñó inglés.”

Sentences 4, 7, 9, and 12, the code-switching sentences, were classified as “Unacceptable” and “Extremely Unacceptable” by 69 percent, 77 percent, 79 percent, and 85 percent of the respondents, respectively. The trend toward less acceptance of the code-switching sentences is seen in the 16 point difference in percentage points between the first and last code-switching sentences in the listening exercise, as if the respondents became less and less tolerant of this variety of Spanish as they heard more of it.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the language attitudes of Mexicans residing in the United States. The specific research questions was: What are the attitudes of Spanish-speaking English as a second language (ESL) students at South Mountain Community College toward different varieties of Spanish?

Research by Garcia and Weller (1985) found that Mexicans have a tendency to view Southwest Spanish negatively. Mexican respondents in Mexico City and Mexican Americans in Los Angeles were asked to listen to and evaluate Spanish sentences ranging from very educated speech to very colloquial, uneducated speech. The authors noted several areas where the Mexican and Mexican American respondents disagreed on the acceptability of Spanish constructions. Garcia and Weller (1985) suggest that these differences in linguistic standards may lead to negative attitudes on the part of Mexican speakers toward the speech of Mexican Americans. Hidalgo (1986) interviewed residents of Juarez, representing a range of socio-economic backgrounds, and found a strong dislike for the mixture of English and Spanish, which the respondents see as typical in the speech of Mexican Americans. In addition, they expressed a definite feeling that the variety of Spanish spoken in the Mexico City is more acceptable and correct than the Spanish spoken in Juarez.
One hundred and three ESL students at South Mountain Community College participated in this study. The subjects were male and female Mexicans representing different English proficiency levels and varying also with regard to age, number of years lived in the U.S., and level of education completed in Mexico. Three types of data were gathered: demographic characteristics, language attitudes, and judgements about the spoken language. The data was analyzed by tabulating frequency counts of responses on the language attitude questionnaire and on the listening exercise and comparing response percentages (frequency count divided by total number of respondents) for each item.

The data indicate unfavorable attitudes toward Southwest Spanish and Spanish-English code-switching. More than three-fourths of the respondents perceived the Spanish spoken in Phoenix as being inferior to the Spanish spoken in Mexico City. Three-fourths of the respondents do not think code-switching sounds good and almost the same number do not want their children to use code-switching.

Respondents reactions to the sentences in the listening exercise basically confirmed the results in the language attitude questionnaire: Southwest Spanish and code-switching are considered unacceptable. For example, two of the Southwest Spanish sentences received negative ratings of 96 percent and 88 percent. In addition, all four code-switching sentences were classified by a large majority of respondents (69%, 77%, 79%, and 85%) as “Unacceptable” and Extremely Unacceptable.”

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this research, it may be concluded that Mexicans residing in the U.S. have negative opinions of Southwest Spanish and Spanish-English code-
switching. Both varieties are considered to be less correct and less acceptable than standard Spanish. In addition, Mexico City Spanish and border Spanish were differentiated, with the latter being viewed as less correct.

An unfavorable reaction toward Southwest Spanish may be based on one "glaring" deviation from the standard. For example, in the sentence “Donde pusites la luz?” the use of pusites for the standard pusiste renders the whole sentence nonstandard in some people’s view, even though three-fourths of the sentence is standard Spanish. As Sanchez (1994) says, a speaker of Southwest Spanish does not use only nonstandard forms, but rather a mixture of standard and nonstandard elements. Furthermore, she claims that the speakers of any language possess not just one variety but several varieties, and, depending on who they are talking to, what they are talking about, and other factors, they can shift from one variety to another. Thus, Mexican Americans may operate on different levels in Spanish depending on whether they are talking to their mother, and old friend from the barrio, or a Spanish professor.

Unfortunately, instead of being credited for using both standard and nonstandard forms and knowing when to use each variety, the speaker of Southwest Spanish is said to speak an incorrect and unacceptable variation of Spanish. Likewise, Spanish-English code-switching is stigmatized. Yet, this variety of Spanish, which is wide-spread among Mexican American bilinguals (Penalosa, 1980), demonstrates linguistic competence.

The findings of this study were expected. Garcia and Weller (1985) noted several areas where Mexican and Mexican American subjects disagreed on the acceptability of Spanish constructions. These differences in linguistic norms, the authors suggest, lead to negative attitudes on the part of Mexican speakers toward the Spanish of Mexican
Americans. Hidalgo (1986) thought that residents of Juarez, due to living in closer proximity to Mexican Americans, would be more accepting of Mexican American Spanish, but this was not the case. They expressed a strong dislike especially for the mixture of English and Spanish (i.e., code-switching).

It is noteworthy that, while the majority of the respondents said that they speak “correct” Spanish, 30 percent indicated that they were not sure. Perhaps their linguistic insecurity stems from their comparison of the Spanish spoken in Mexico City and the Spanish spoken in border towns like Juarez and Nogales. If they identify more with the Spanish spoken in border towns, and see it as inferior to Mexico City Spanish, they are victims of negative language attitudes as much as the Mexican Americans whose Spanish is often the target of criticism.

**Recommendations**

A couple of recommendations for implementing the findings are as follows:

1. In ESL classes that serve basically Spanish speakers, teachers should help students develop an awareness of and appreciation for linguistic variety. First of all, the teacher can present some variant forms and explain how Southwest Spanish clearly demonstrates rule-governed behavior. For example, “Yo sabo” is the regular conjugation of verbs that end in -er (i.e., -o ending in the first person singular).

2. In high schools and colleges that offer Spanish classes for native speakers, teachers should use reading and vocabulary development materials that incorporate different varieties of Spanish, including of course the standard form. Therefore, rather
than trying to eradicate the students' bad language habits, the emphasis is on helping them acquire a new variety of Spanish without rejecting their own local variety.

Implications of these findings for future research are as follows:

1. Respondents should be interviewed individually in order to get answers to open-ended questions that would provide more qualitative data on language attitudes.

2. If possible, observe students as they interact with speakers of standard Spanish, Southwest Spanish, and Spanish-English code-switching and note their language behavior as well as their attitudinal behavior.
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Demographic Data (English Version)

The purpose of this research is to examine attitudes toward different varieties of Spanish. All responses will be confidential.

1. Gender:
   Male____ Female____

2. Age:
   18-25____ 26-34____ 35-40____ Over 40____

3. ESL class currently enrolled in:
   ENG 009____ ENG 010____ ENG 011____ ENG 012____

4. Highest level of education completed in Mexico:
   Less than Elementary____ Elementary____ Jr. High____
   High School____ College____ Other (please specify) __________

5. Highest level of education completed in the U.S.
   Elementary____ Jr. High____ High School____

6. How many children do you have?
   0____ 1-2____ 3-4____ 5-6____ More than 6____

7. Where were you born?
   ____________________________ (City or Town) _________________ (State)

8. Where did you grow up?
   ____________________________ (City or Town) _________________ (State)

9. How long have you lived in the U.S.?
   0-5 years____ 6-10 years____ 11-20 years____ Over 20 years____

10. What was your occupation in Mexico?
    ____________________________

11. What is your occupation in the U.S.?
    ____________________________
DATOS DEMOGRAFICOS

El propósito de este estudio es investigar las opiniones sobre variedades del idioma español. Sus respuestas serán completamente confidenciales.

1. Sexo:
   Hombre _____  Mujer _____

2. Edad:
   18-25 _____  26-34 _____  35-40 _____  Mas de 40 _____

3. La clase de ESL en la cual estás ahora.
   ENG 009 _____  ENG 010 _____  ENG 011 _____  ENG 012 _____

4. El nivel más alto de educación que completaste en México:
   Menos de seis años _____  Primaria _____  Secundaria _____
   Preparatoria _____  Universidad _____  Otro (favor de especificar) _______________

5. El nivel más alto de educación que ha completado en los Estados Unidos:
   Ninguno _____  Primaria _____  Secundaria _____  Otro (favor de especificar) _______________

6. Cuántos años ha vivido en los Estados Unidos?
   0-5 años _____  6-10 años _____  11-20 años _____  Mas de 20 años _____

7. Donde nació?
   (Pueblo o Ciudad)  (Estado)

8. Donde se crio?
   (Pueblo o Ciudad)  (Estado)

9. Cuántos hijos tiene?
   0 _____  1-2 _____  3-4 _____  5-6 _____  Mas de seis _____

10. Cual era su ocupación/trabajo en México? _____________________________

11. Cual es su ocupación/trabajo en los Estados Unidos? _____________________________
APPENDIX B

ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

(English and Spanish Versions)
DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS? (Circle the number that best describes how you feel.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>They Are the Same</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Spanish spoken in Mexican border towns is more correct than that spoken in Phoenix.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Spanish spoken in Mexico City is more correct than that spoken in Mexican border towns.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Spanish spoken in Phoenix is more correct than that spoken in Mexican border towns.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Spanish spoken in Phoenix is more correct than that spoken in Mexico city.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Circle the number that best describes how you feel.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Mexican Americans from Phoenix should imitate the Mexicans from Mexico when they speak Spanish.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It sounds good when Mexican Americans from Phoenix change from Spanish to English and from English to Spanish in the same sentence.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is impossible to understand what Mexican Americans from Phoenix say when they mix the two languages.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I speak correct Spanish.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I want my children to know how to speak mixing the two languages.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESTÁ DE ACUERDO O NO ESTÁ DE ACUERDO CON LAS SIGUIENTES DECLARACIONES?
(Favor de poner un círculo sobre el número que describe mejor su opinión.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estoy Totalmente en Desacuerdo</th>
<th>No Estoy de Acuerdo</th>
<th>Son Igualtes</th>
<th>Estoy de Acuerdo</th>
<th>Estoy Totalmente de Acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>El español que se habla en la frontera es más correcto que el que se habla en Phoenix.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>El español que se habla en el Distrito Federal es más correcto que el que se habla en la frontera.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>El español que se habla en Phoenix es más correcto que el que se habla en la frontera.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>El español que se habla en Phoenix es más correcto que el que se habla en el Distrito Federal.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Favor de poner un círculo sobre el número que describe mejor su opinión.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estoy Totalmente en Desacuerdo</th>
<th>No Estoy de Acuerdo</th>
<th>No Estoy Seguro</th>
<th>Estoy de Acuerdo</th>
<th>Estoy Totalmente de Acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Los Mexico-Americanos de Phoenix deberían de imitar a los Mexicanos de México cuando hablan español.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Se oye bien cuando los Mexico-Americanos de Phoenix cambian del español al inglés y del inglés al español en la misma oración.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Es imposible entender lo que dicen los Mexico-Americanos de Phoenix cuando mezclan los dos idiomas.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Yo hablo el español correcto.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Yo quiero que mis hijos sepan mezclar los dos idiomas cuando hablen.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

LISTENING EXERCISE

(English and Spanish Versions)
**WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE FOLLOWING TAPE-RECORDED SENTENCES?**

(Circle the number that best describes your opinion.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Educated</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Extremely Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hasta la fecha me gusta mucho Chihuahua..</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ¿Onde pusites la luz?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uno de mis hijos vive para El Paso, aunque no en la mesa ciudad.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cada día se lleva su coffeepot upstairs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tuvimos un buen tiempo.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. En Mexico todos los profesionistas tienen que hacer servicio social.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I’m sure si la limpiaran once a week, it wouldn’t be that dirty.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mi mama me lleva pa’tras pa’ la escuela.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ponlo en el refrigerator so it won’t spoil.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. En ese lugar acostumbran comer a las cuatro de la tarde.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mi maestra los enseno ingles.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Que peace and quiet sin la television.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUAL ES SU OPINION SOBRE LAS SIGUIENTES ORACIONES GRABADAS?

(Favor de poner un circulo sobre el numero que describe mejor su opinion.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Culto</th>
<th>Correcto</th>
<th>Popular Aceptable</th>
<th>Popular Inceptable</th>
<th>Mayormente Inceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>