ENMARCANDO Y COMPRENDIENDO LA SITUACION LINGUISTICA EN LIMON, PROVINCIA DE COSTA RICA A TRAVES DEL ESTUDIO DE ACTITUDES SOBRE LA LENGUA.

Revista de Filologia y Linguistica de la Universidad de Costa Rica

October 1, 2018

Section: Pg. 101; Vol. 44; No. 2; ISSN: 0377-628X

Length: 15134 words

Byline: Aguilar-Sanchez, Jorge

Body

FRAMING AND UNDERSTANDING THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION FOUND IN LIMON, COSTA RICA THROUGH THE STUDY OF ***LANGUAGE*** ATTITUDES

1. Introduction

Attitudes are favorable or unfavorable responses to stimuli. In the case of ***language*** attitudes, it is the response to stimuli from varieties of a single ***language*** or different ***languages***, or alternatively to their speakers (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998). The study of ***language*** attitudes is found in two different primary fields of inquiry: social psychology and sociolinguistics.

In social psychology, attitudes are studied from the perspective of the importance of perception, which is the foundation of all social constructions, both individual and group relationships. Perception reflects the accumulated social knowledge individuals carry with them. An example of these attitudes is when people see dialects as "better" or "worse." Within this regard, Edwards (1999) states that sensory data is filtered through perception, and this filter is culturally established and maintained. For example, more favorable attitudes might be attached to those varieties that are perceived to sound better, or seem more mellifluous, or seem to sound more musical, and so forth (Edwards, 1999). Edwards (1999) also states that the variation found in speech-evaluation studies reflects social perceptions of the speakers of given varieties and has nothing to say ***about*** any intrinsic qualities--logical or aesthetic--of the ***language*** or dialect itself. He also states that these social perceptions of speech are not random, they are systematic. An example of these studies is Purnell, Idsardi, and Baugh (1999) in which the researchers were concerned with "the linguistic nature of housing discrimination" regarding African-American Vernacular ***English***, Chicano ***English***, and Standard American ***English***. In this study, the authors asked if discrimination based on dialect can occur because of phonetic cues alone. One of the authors, who was able to talk in the three dialects under study, called several landlords ***about*** apartments they had advertised for rent. Each of the landlords was called three times, once in each dialect, and the dependent variable was whether the landlords rang back to confirm an appointment to view the apartment. Their study showed that auditory cues constitute stimuli for unequal treatment. This study and the other studies reported in Purnell, Idsardi, & Baugh (1999) serve as empirical evidence that variation found in speech-evaluation studies reflects only social perceptions of the speakers of given varieties and are not related to the ***language*** or dialect itself (Edwards, 1999).

The study of attitudes in sociolinguistics has always shared overlapping concerns and involvement with social psychology (Garrett, 2001). Sociolinguistics shares many approaches with social psychology in addition to the

quantitative and experimental research traditions that characterize both. These approaches range from relatively straightforward questionnaires and interview surveys to experimental (matched-guise) studies employing semantic differential scales. The latter are mostly all representative of social positivism where attitudes are seen as feelings, thoughts, and predispositions to act in a specific way and more recent innovations that attempt to address some of the controversies of earlier methods (Garrett, 2001). Some of the traditional studies are based on perceptual dialectological and folk linguistic approaches (e.g. Niedzielski & Preston, 2000). Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998) put forward a list of studies within the positivistic paradigm including studies ***about*** inner circle varieties by Alford & Strother (1990) and Starks and Paltridge (1994); ***about*** Outer Circle varieties by Shaw (1983), Sure (1991), de Klerk (1996); and ***about*** the Expanding Circle varieties by Raji Zughoul & Taminian (1984), Benson (1991), Flaitz (1993), Verkuyeten et al. (1994), Chiba et al. (1995), Pulcini (1997), Dalton (1997), Dalton-Puffer et al. (1997) (in Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 346).

The newer approaches to the study of ***language*** attitudes are represented by the work of Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998) in which they call for a revision of the methodology of the study of ***language*** attitudes from the traditional methods mentioned above to a more discourse (oral or written) oriented one.2 They framed their work in a new paradigm, Social Constructionism, which changes the notion of ***language*** as a direct reflection of what goes on in a person's mind to a means of constructing the social world during everyday interactions. Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998, pp. 346-347) state that until recently it was taken for granted that each individual possessed a mind, an internal organ of thought that mediated between them and the world out there; and also that an individual's mind had principles of operation of its own, owing nothing to history or society. They argue, instead, that these constructions are built out of the linguistic resources available in a society, and that they are acquired through time by its members. For example, negative or positive attitudes towards the variety of a ***language*** can arise from perception of social status, which has nothing at all to do with ***language***. In Costa Rica, for example, the ***English*** spoken by Afro-Costa Ricans is considered "braad talk" or 'broad talk (Purcell, 1993), and thus creating a negative reputation for the ***language***. This reputation has been acquired over the years and through the contact of this variety with speakers of another ***language*** (i.e. Spanish). It is spoken by a minority of people that did not have Costa Rican citizenship until after 1948 (i.e. descendants of Jamaican workers brought to work on the construction of the railroad [see Aguilar-Sanchez (2005) for more details]).

Attitudes within this paradigm are social and context-dependent by nature. For example, people ***use*** positive or negative attitudes to externalize their view of the world through oral interactions. Thus, mental entities and processes, which include attitudes, are taken as properties of discourse. Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998) state that attitudes as evaluative practices can be ***used*** for different purposes in discourse and it that happens at two levels. One level is attitudes ***about*** an issue and the other is arguing ***about*** the issue. Within this paradigm words are the thoughts, and the pattern of the argument is seen as a record of the activity of thinking. Discourse is not only the outcome of thinking, but it is also a record of the thinking process (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998). Kalaja (1997) points out that we should not assume people hold attitudes towards a variety of a ***language*** and that attitudes are to be located as stable entities in the mind; instead, we should concentrate on analyzing ***how*** attitudes are constructed in people's discourse, written or oral, through argumentation. Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998) conclude that with a shift from cognitive representation to discursive construction, scholars should reconsider their traditional definitions of attitudes. In the last decade and a half, studies on attitudes have shifted to include the study of variables such as the role of ***language*** attitudes on ***language*** survival or attrition (e.g. Bell, 2013; Cherciov, 2013; Dowling, Ellison, & Leal, 2012; among others) and on national policies, attitudes, and their relationship to ***language*** shift (e.g. Chakrani & Huang, 2014; Crezee, 2012; Gonzalez-Riano, Hevia-Artime, & Fernandez-Costales, 2013; Sallabank, 2013; Simpson, 2013, among others).

2. Background of ***English*** in Costa Rica

2.1 ***English*** as a first ***language***

English is spoken as a first ***language*** by 73% of Afro-Costa Ricans (Aguilar-Sanchez, 2005, p. 167) . This variety in particular is spoken along the Caribbean coast of the country in the province of Limon (see Figure 1). These numbers have been decreasing over the years due to the lack of preparation of teachers to teach ***languages***

different from Spanish (the ***official language***), the ***language*** policies dictated by the government after 1948, and the immigration of Spanish monolinguals to Limon (Purcell, 1993). The situation is different from what it was three decades ago when many teachers were not aware of the importance of the ***language*** in the Caribbean (i.e. ***English***) due to their lack of preparation in the field of ***Language*** Education and the position of Spanish as the ***official language*** (Purcell, 1993).

Because of the lack of preparation of teachers and ***language*** policies, the influence of Spanish as the ***official language***, the migration of Spanish speakers to the province of Limon, and the low social status that the Limonese variety of ***English*** held, many native speakers of this ***English*** variety decided not to speak it anymore and adopted Spanish as their first ***language***. There were several policies from the Ministry of Education aimed at the general status of education in Costa Rica that did not take into account the bilingualism of the residents of Limon. One such policy sent teachers trained to teach Spanish as a first ***language*** and not ***English***. After 1948, when citizenship was granted to residents of Limon and the mass immigration from inside the country caused by the granting of land and job opportunities, the government established Spanish as the only ***language*** of instruction in the Costa Rican public school system. This policy eliminated the need for the ***English*** schools that were established by the Jamaican immigrants upon their arrival to Limon. However, people continued to be educated in ***English*** through Sunday schools (Melendez Chaverri & Duncan, 1974; Purcell, 1993). Even more, the social status and the perception of ***English*** and its relation to race and prestige played a major role in this phenomenon as pointed by Purcell (1993):

The insistence on Spanish was more pronounced among young Black women. I frequently spoke to a young female assistant at a pulperia (3) who always ***used*** Spanish. I had begun to assume that she did not speak ***English*** until I saw her, in the company of other females at a local Saturday night dance, speaking very expressively in Limon Creole. A fair conclusion: Spanish is a component of respectability, especially in formal situations (Purcell, 1993, p. 114)

... Young people, of high school age and older, having been schooled in Spanish, are more confident in its ***use***, especially when speaking with outsiders. They have been led to think that Limon Creole (or "mek-a-tel-yu," as they call it) is "bad" ***language***--"banana ***language***," "braad talk." Yet those who can speak Standard ***English*** display a proud willingness to ***use*** it in situations where others would opt for Spanish--... (Purcell, 1993, p. 116)

Another possible reason for this decline is observed in the attitude of young women (and youngsters in general) concerning speaking Spanish with certain people and ***English*** with others mainly as a way to express knowledge of both ***languages*** in order to establish a high social position (Purcell, 1993). Purcell (1993) also points out that Afro-Costa Ricans have been led to believe that their ***English*** (4) is "bad ***language***", "banana ***language***" or "braad talk".

He argues that in Limon, as in countries where other varieties of ***English*** are called Creoles (e.g. Jamaica, Guyana, Belize, and Trinidad, among others), a ***language*** continuum (5) formed by a basilect (i.e. vernacular-uninstructed ***language***), mesolect (i.e. a mixture between a basilect and an acrolect), and an acrolect (i.e. standardized variety of a ***language***) is found. To exemplify this, Purcell (1993) ***makes*** the following assertion "... those who speak Standard ***English*** display a proud willingness to ***use*** it in situations where others would opt for Spanish..." (p. 116). Thus, while some believe that this variety of ***English*** was derived from Creole via decreolization of basilects under the influence of acrolects, Winford (1997) argues against this claim and puts forward an alternative that in the Caribbean varieties of ***English*** (Limonese ***English*** belongs to this group) a continuum such as that described by Purcell (1993) has existed since the earliest periods of contact.

Nowadays the panorama is different, for some schools are teaching ***English*** and children are encouraged to speak it in most social situations; however, Spanish is still the primary means of communication with other non-Afro-Costa Ricans.

2.2 ***English*** as a Foreign ***Language***

Since 1824, ***English*** has been the first foreign ***language*** taught from grade 7 to grade 11 or 12 in Costa Rican public schools. It was not as popular among Costa Ricans before 1990, when the tourist industry started growing

rapidly and many multinationals such as Intel settled on Costa Rican soil. When the choice of a foreign ***language*** becomes optional in grades 10 and 11, 90% of the students choose ***English*** over French (Cabrera & Ancker, 1997). In 1997 ***English*** became the first foreign ***language*** to be taught starting in the first grade in the public school system. Former President Figueres Olsen, 1994-1998, went as far as advocating for ***making*** classes in ***English*** obligatory (Infocostarica, 2000).

Furthermore, ***English*** is the medium of instruction in many private and international schools available to the people of Costa Rica. Some of these schools offer total immersion programs (all subjects in ***English***) while others offer only partial immersion (half the total subjects are taught in ***English***). An explosion of private Costa Rican and foreign schools has eased over-crowding in the public schools and has provided an alternative educational system for those who can afford it (Infocostarica, 2000), thus providing Costa Ricans with more contact situations in ***English***.

This migration from public to private schools has increased the perception of ***English*** among Costa Ricans as a high-status ***language*** for social and economic growth. This phenomenon is not foreign to Costa Ricans in Limon for there had been previous private bilingual schools which reflected the population's different beliefs ***about language***. Some of these schools focus entirely on the teaching of American ***English*** (e.g. The Maria Inmaculada School) as a way for economic change and others on the teaching of ***English*** as a cultural heritage (i.e. Limonese or Jamaican ***English***) such as The Caribbean School. While public schools are still bound to the national curriculum for the teaching of ***English*** as a foreign ***language***, such national policy does not take into account the different varieties of ***English*** found in Costa Rica.

Similarly, majors in Teaching ***English*** and ***English*** Linguistics and Literature have been taught entirely in ***English*** at universities. However, a minimum reading proficiency was established as a foreign ***language*** requirement for graduation in all majors. For technology majors, five hours a semester for three semesters of conversational ***English*** have been added to the curriculum. Schools offer ***language*** centers for everyone who desires to study ***English*** (e.g. ***English Learning*** Center at the Universidad Interamericana, Universidad Internacional de las Americas [UIA], Universidad Autonoma de Centro America [UACA] and Centro de Ingles Conversacional-Universidad Nacional "Center for Conversational ***English***" [CEIC-UNA]).

Outside of the public educational system a host of ***Language*** Centers that are crowded with Costa Ricans studying ***English*** as a foreign ***language*** can be found (e.g. Pro-***English***, Idioma Internacional, Ingles Empresarial, Conversa, Universal de Idiomas, Intercultura ***Language*** School, and The Costa Rican-American Cultural Center, among others) (Lazarus, 2002). Additionally, bilingual Costa Ricans are ***using English*** more in their jobs, especially in tourism, foreign enterprises, etc. It is also common to listen to Costa Ricans practicing their ***English*** in restaurants, bars, dance clubs among other places.

2.3 Previous Studies on the study of attitude towards ***English***

Friedrich (2000) studied the attitudes towards inner circle varieties (i.e. British versus American ***English***) among students in Brazilian universities. She found that the desire for ***learning English*** for social ascension attracts people to the ***language***. Her results also confirm that attitudes directed at the stereotype the listener holds of the speaker and his or her ***language*** indicates that speakers of one variety of ***English*** (i.e. British ***English***), are easier to understand than speakers of other varieties (i.e. American ***English***).

Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998) studied ***language*** attitudes of college students towards ***English*** in Finland. As mentioned previously, they put forward a redefinition of the terms regarding attitudes and a reconsideration of methodology in research of ***language*** attitudes based on the paradigm in social psychology. After positive and negative attitudes were identified, interpretive repertoires were created. These repertoires are the result of the classification of participants' essays according to what features regarding attitudes were found within each essay. For the negative attitudes, these repertoires included categories such as

(a) a segregating repertoire, which deals with the concern for the decay of Finnish under the influence of ***English***:

Example: The Finns have gone mad with ***English*** expressions, repeating them as if they were magic words (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 350), and

(b) the national-romanticist repertoire, which deals with the conflict between the two ***languages***.

Example: Of course it is necessary for every Finn to be able to speak ***English*** in the modern world but it is at least as necessary to preserve our national ***language*** without forgetting its wealth of expression and beauty. Let us fight for the survival of our ***language*** (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 351), and

(c) the fatalist repertoire, which deals with the conflict between individuals and groups that have control over the form or correctness of ***languages***.

Example: Anglo-American culture 'fed' to us for decades, for example, by television, films and music has left traces in our ***use*** of Finnish (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 351), and

(d) the realist repertoire, which deals with the possible negative consequences caused by ***using*** a mixture of both ***languages***.

Example: The older people, especially, do not necessarily know what (***English***) words mean; it is actually discrimination against a part of the people, if they do not know what kind of products are sold in a shop named 'Toyland' (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 351).

For the positive attitudes, these repertoires included (a) the empiricist repertoire that deals with the neutralization of the arguments presented in the essay to which they had to respond, and the normalization of the influence of ***English*** on Finnish by citing historical and/ or linguistic facts or through personal observations.

Example: ***Languages*** have influenced each other all through centuries, even through millennia, they seem not to remember the fact that when William the Conqueror defeated the ***English***, it caused a similar situation. My grandmother often ***used*** loan words ... My mother does so seldom and I myself hardly ever. (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 352), and

(b) the nationalist repertoire that strengthens the status of Finnish, the identity of the Finns, and the image of the country by putting Finns' ability to speak ***languages*** above those of other countries.

Example: Finns speak foreign ***languages*** better than people in Southern Europe (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 352), and

(c) the utilitarian repertoire, which tries to convince the audience of his/her writings of the practical advantages of adopting words from ***English*** into Finnish and of knowing ***English***.

Example: He [the writer of the letter] could try translating ***English*** terms such as 'unisex', 'happy hour' and 'talk show' into Finnish, and with these translations maintaining the same idea and being as apt and handy to ***use*** as the original loan words (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 352).

Battenburg (1997) describes the competition between ***English*** and French in Tunisian educational institutions and programs. In his recounting of the history of ***English*** in Tunisia, he states that changes in ***language*** ***use*** and preference are becoming increasingly apparent where ***English*** is gaining terrain over French. He also states that attitudes of ***officials*** concerning ***English*** in education are changing when the need to know ***English*** is included as part of the definition of being an intellectual.

Studies on ***language*** attitudes outside of the field of World Englishes have been directed to attitudes towards registers within one ***language*** (e.g. Ladegaard, 2000 in Danish), studies of attitudes towards two ***languages*** different than ***English*** in bilingual societies like Spanish and Guarani in Paraguay (Choi, 2003), and studies of inner circle varieties (e.g. American and/or British ***English***) and outer circle varieties (Thumboo, 2003). Yet, the attitudes

towards an inner circle variety such as that spoken in Limon and an expanding circle variety of ***English*** like the one spoken in the rest of Costa Rica has not been widely studied. Hence, the need for the present work.

2.4 Previous Studies on Attitudes towards Limonese ***English*** (LE)

Studies on attitudes towards Limonese ***English*** and/or its speakers are limited, and because of the diverse ways of addressing the name of this variety, different names are ***used*** here. In the literature, these names are based on the authors' field of inquiry. The reader is advised that in the present paper all of the following terms refer to the same variety: Limonese ***English***. These names are Limonese Creole, Limonese ***English***, and Mekatelyuw. Other varieties are referred to as follows: American ***English*** (Standard American ***English***), British ***English*** (Standard British ***English***) and Spanish (Standard Costa Rican Spanish).

Bryce-Laporte (1962), Herzfeld (1978, 2004), and Purcell (1993) found that the place where the speaker was reared is linked to their attitudes towards Limonese ***English***. In general, residents of rural areas expressed more positive feelings towards Limonese Creole than urban residents. Winkler (1999) points out a significant factor for the study of attitudes that distinguishes Purcell's (1993) and Bryce-Laporte's (1962) studies which may have influenced the responses from the participants. This factor was the ***use*** of two different names to refer to the ***language*** spoken in Limon. Winkler (1999) states that Purcell's study, performed more than ten years after the Bryce study, shows a marked difference in ***how*** urban and rural Blacks feel ***about language***, and it is worth noting that Purcell ***used*** the word ***English*** and not Limonese creole in his study. The results of Purcell's (1993) study show that the 130 urban participants he surveyed were evenly divided between Spanish and ***English*** in terms of their ***language*** preference; notwithstanding, 74.5% of a total of 87 from rural areas preferred ***English***.

Winkler (1999) claims that although speakers may express preferences for a ***language***, it does not always translate into action. His claim is supported by Spence's (1993) findings that 90% of her respondents said that it was important to keep Limonese ***English*** while 82% said they preferred Limonese ***English*** to Spanish. Spence's respondents, however, ***make*** a contradiction in their responses. The contradiction is expressed by 86% of the respondents who in the same study said that it was important to keep Limonese ***English***, but added that they did not want their children to ***learn*** it because speaking it may hinder their children's upward mobility.

In her sociolinguistic study on Limonese Creole or Mekatelyuw, Herzfeld (2004) discovered that education level seems to be another social factor related to the ***use*** of the linguistic forms that represent the different lects. Within the basilect (i.e. vernacularuninstructed ***language***) unmarked forms can be found (i.e. verb roots), which are ***used*** as specific grammatical functions within the system and four marked forms (i.e. Herzfeld, 1978; {did}, [/a/ + verb], /don/, and basilectal negation /no/). The mesolect (i.e. a mixture between a basilect and an acrolect) is represented by the forms (Herzfeld) as /de/ and /a/; {did} + verb; /a/ + verb; and /don/. Finally, the acrolect (i.e. standardized variety of the ***language***). She points out that the prohibition of ***English*** schools by the Costa Rican Government seems to have influenced the second generational group she studied because the teaching of ***English*** under the new system was not as strict as the old system. Her findings are conclusive in that those speakers who received standard ***English*** instruction (Group Age I: older generation) ***used*** the mesolect markers (i.e. be as /de/ and /a/; did + verb; /a/ + verb; and /don/) more than those who did not. Thus, young speakers and professionals tended to ***use*** more Spanish, adults both, and the elders ***English***. Herzfeld (2004) also found that the acrolect of Limonese Creole has limited value for the younger generations. This lect has been replaced by Spanish. This process is more salient within the speakers of the mesolect.

Herzfeld (2004) concludes that Limon's linguistic situation is more complex than other ***language*** contact situations, and that this higher level of complexity can be attributed to the interaction of different ***English*** varieties found there, and to the presence of a third ***language***: Spanish. Herzfeld (1980) also found that speakers express more negative attitudes towards Limonese ***English*** than towards Spanish.

Spence (1993) suggests that the ***use*** of Spanish stems from negative attitudes towards speakers of the acrolect because it may be perceived as 'putting on airs' when the entire group in a discussion speaks the basilect or mesolect. Spence believes that the ***use*** of more standard forms contributes to social distance between

interlocutors. She thinks that, in general, the ***use*** of Standard ***English*** (i.e. the acrolect) for everyday conversation is seen as pretentious and insincere. She also thinks that this perception is the likely cause of rejection of the interlocutor, as they will be perceived as putting themselves above their listeners. This behavior places pressure on the speakers to ***use*** some forms along the mesolect as a sign of solidarity. Furthermore, Spence (1993) puts forward two scenarios for the future of Limonese ***English***: the first one is its death and the total shift to Spanish. The second is reverse bilingualism, where Spanish becomes the first ***language*** and ***English*** the second ***language***.

Simms (1990) studied the attitudes of descendants of Limonese ***English*** speakers who do not speak it towards Limonese ***English*** and found that in general terms their attitudes are positive, except among those with a low level of education and low income. Simms found that the educational level of the speaker seems to influence attitudes towards Limonese ***English***.

3. Framing Limonese ***English*** for the study of attitudes

Data collection and research design ***about*** the linguistic situation in Limon have been challenging because answers to instruments are given with a positive or negative attitude towards the ***language*** variety under study. For example, imagine young researchers attempting to collect data within the framework of Creoles. They may find it difficult because when they ask the question "Can you speak Patua, Mekatelyuw, or Creole for me?" and the speaker responds that he or she does not speak that ***language***, emphatically adding that he or she speaks ***English***, their investigations will come to a halt due to the negative attitude of the interviewee towards Creole. As a result, speakers may refuse to participate in the study. Data, in this scenario, when collected center on the belief that Limonese ***English*** is ***just*** another Creole because the young researchers only gathered data from those speakers who hold that belief and are willing to respond to the questions of the researchers. Similarly, a seasoned researcher may have already identified informants who are willing to participate and are aware of the differences between the varieties they speak, which may also hinder the randomness of the data because data points will be concentrated on structures of interest or on overgeneralizations made by the speaker to highlight the answers to research questions. Purcell's (1993) example cited above serves as an example of potential informants ***using*** their preconceptions to respond in the ***language*** that hold a higher status regardless of ***how*** many other ***languages*** they speak. At this point of any study, despite having a good framework, the data collection process is hindered because the randomness of the data is altered rendering data that are heavily skewed towards the belief that researchers and informants hold as true together. Therefore, understanding the linguistic situation and the attitudes towards it is paramount for research design for two reasons. First, it allows the randomness of the data collected to be intact, which helps on the generalizability of the results. Second, it allows potential participants to provide ***language*** samples with little attitudinal interference. The field of World Englishes (WE) has provided a framework to collect data in such a way without jeopardizing its randomness, and shows independence of speakers' views and beliefs related to their ***language***.

Braj Kachru (1984, 1985, 1990) proposed a model consisting of three concentric circles to explain the different varieties of ***English*** found worldwide. Bruthiaux (2003) describes this model as follows: The Inner Circle comprises locations where ***English*** is the ***language*** of a substantial, often monolingual majority (e.g. USA, UK, Ireland, Australia, etc.). A major characteristic of these varieties is that they are largely self-normative, finding within themselves the norms of correctness and appropriateness to be ***used*** and spread through ***language*** education and ***language*** curricula. The Outer Circle represents locations that were typically under British or American colonial rule before becoming independent, and where ***English*** continues to be ***used*** for inter-ethnic communication (i.e. between the colonizer and the locals or between locals that were from different ethnic groups) as well as the dominant ***language*** by those at the top of the socioeconomic ladder. These ***English***-speaking--or at least ***English***-knowing--communities range in size and geopolitical importance from India to Nauru through Nigeria, Kenya, the Philippines, Singapore, and Fiji, among others. Finally, The Expanding Circle represents societies where ***English*** is not passed on naturally to infants over generations, but is taught in schools to an increasing number of learners for activities involving members of other local linguistic communities as well as for international trade and tourism. The Expanding Circle comprises every nation not included in the Inner or Outer circles. In these locations, ***English*** tends to rely on target forms of inner circle varieties for linguistic norms to be taught and spread through formal education.

Costa Rica presents an unusual situation within the World Englishes paradigm, and Kachru's (1984, 1985, 1990) concentric circles model, because of the presence of both a variety that can be classified as belonging to the inner circle varieties, and a variety that is developing and can be classified as an expanding circle variety. It also differs from many of the contexts so far studied within World Englishes, for Costa Rica was never colonized by an ***English***-speaking country (i.e. the United States or Great Britain). This variety of ***English***, that is situated within the inner circle varieties, was introduced to the country by means of an immigration-workrelated diaspora. Afro-Costa Ricans came to Limon for work, not as slaves, from different islands in the Caribbean, mostly from Jamaica, bringing with them their ***language***: ***English***. Herzfeld (1983, 2004) and Winkler (1999) believe that this variety of ***English*** was derived from Creole via decreolization of basilects under the influence of acrolects.

English of the inner circle variety (i.e. American or British) has been a target ***language*** in the Costa Rican educational curriculum as a foreign ***language*** for nearly one hundred years (Aguilar-Sanchez, 2005). This peculiarity serves as ground for ***language*** attitudes, both positive and negative, towards the two varieties of ***English*** that are found in Limon. These attitudes can be found in the general society and in the national educational system. Because of its complex linguistic position, a study on attitudes regarding varieties of ***English*** is urgently needed since the ***English*** regarded here as an inner circle variety is vulnerable due to its lack of acknowledgement as a ***language*** among non-linguists. This study aims to investigate the social perception of these two varieties of ***English***, people's attitudes towards each one of them, and ***how*** these attitudes affect the relationship between the two varieties.

Figures 2 and 3 below show a visual representation of the linguistic situation in Limon, and the varieties that result from this contact situation. The two varieties of ***English*** can be seen within the WE framework, a variety of Spanish, and a hybrid variety of ***English*** and Spanish are the result of such constant contact. It contributes to the complexity regarding attitudes explored in this work.

4. The present study

Framed within the WE paradigm, two varieties of ***English*** are found in Costa Rica. From this perspective and based on previous studies, it can be inferred that the expanding circle variety (i.e. Target American or British ***English***) possess a higher social status than the inner circle variety (i.e. Limonese ***English***). The difference in status among these two varieties becomes evident when comparing the educational polices mentioned where the teaching of Limonese ***English*** is not considered or discussed in schools, and the fact that some Limonese ***English*** speakers have labeled their ***language*** as "braad talk" 'broad talk (Purcell, 1993). Positive attitudes towards target inner circle variety (i.e. American or British ***English***) can be extrapolated from the literature published ***about*** it. On the other hand, Limonese ***English*** is immersed in a sea of mixed attitudes reflecting the increasing trend of negative attitudes found in many geographical areas regarding minority ***language*** varieties (Thomason, 2001). A third factor influencing these attitudes is that Spanish is the ***official language*** of Costa Rica. Because of this, all government policies ***about language*** education are dictated from the perspective of a monolingual Costa Rica, putting Limonese ***English*** at a disadvantage. As Friedrich (2000) states, the study of attitudes within World Englishes, being an essential part of the field's approach to ***language use***, has been directed by attitudes towards the expanding circle varieties compared to attitudes towards mother ***languages*** other than ***English*** or its inner circle varieties. This study seeks to contribute to the study of ***language*** attitudes as it investigates them from a point of view that has not yet been explored: ***language*** attitudes towards both an inner circle variety and an expanding circle variety, and the struggle that the presence of both varieties within the same geographical area represents. This study contributes to the general understanding of the power relationships between traditional inner circle varieties and varieties that have not yet been included within this category. Studying the interaction of two different ***English*** varieties in a geographically small country such as Costa Rica (micro-level) will shed light on the understanding of the interaction of varieties of the same kind on a global level (macro-level). Thus, reaching a level of understanding of ***language*** attitudes that help societies understand and avoid misconceptions ***about languages*** that may arise from the lack of a bridge between theory and the real world. The present work also sets forward a methodology to quantify qualitative data to be able to carry out inferential statistical analyses such as a binomial regression.

To study the attitudes towards these varieties of ***English*** from the viewpoint of their respective speakers, two research questions must be asked:

1. What is the social perception of the inner circle variety of ***English*** in Limon, and the expanding circle variety of ***English*** in the rest of the country? What are the attitudes towards each of these varieties?

2. Does this social perception resemble the global tendency towards the preference for traditional inner circle varieties (i.e. American or British ***English***)?

5. Methodology

5.1 Participants

A survey-essay instrument was applied to one hundred and nine Costa Ricans: eightyone females and 28 males. The sample was composed of ***English*** teachers, prospective ***English*** teachers, and people from the community of Limon and other parts of the country. To better describe the population under study, Table 1 shows raw scores and percentages gathered from the background questionnaire.

5.2 Data Collection and procedure

Based on Ladegaard's (2000, p. 227) call for the ***use*** of eclectic methods that "...[one] could argue, a positive correlation in the quantitative data, as well as a positive relationship between open-ended responses and sociolinguistic behavior, would have provided us with the ultimate support to the tripartite model", and on Hyrkstedt & Kalaja's (1998) call for a change in the collection of data and ***how*** to analize it, a decision was made to ***use*** an instrument that includes both quantitative data and qualitative discourse responses to written stimuli.

These quantitative data were collected via a written questionnaire similar to the one employed by Choi (2003) in her study in Paraguay, and the qualitative data were similar to that ***used*** by Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998) in their study in Finland. The instrument ***used*** to elicit the data in the present study reflects both approaches in an attempt to reach a positive correlation between the two types of data.

5.2.1 Quantitative Questionnaire

The quantitative questionnaire is a series of open-ended questions as well as yes/no questions eliciting attitudes towards each of the varieties of ***English*** spoken in Costa Rica. The first eight questions of the questionnaire are background questions to elicit age, gender, economic status via the profession (in Costa Rica social and economic status can be perceived by the profession because the minimum wages per profession are government regulated), place of residence and for ***how*** long they have lived there, and ***languages*** spoken (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. Quantitative questionnaire: Background and general information Pseudonym (a name you will like us to call you):-- 1. Gender: M F 2. Age:-- 2. Education: -- (last level achieved) 3. If Student, major:-- Mother's profession:-- Father's profession:-- 4. If not a student: Profession:-- 5. Place of birth:-- ***How*** long did you live there?--years. 6. Where do you live?--For ***how*** long?-- 7. What ***languages*** do you speak? Spanish ***English*** Chinese Other If other, which one?-- 8. At what age did you ***learn*** to speak Spanish?--***English***?--

In this questionnaire the name or pseudonym was elicited in order to see ***how*** attitudes towards a specific variety are reflected through the ***use*** of identity. The expectation being that more positive attitudes toward one ***language*** (Spanish or ***English***) would trigger the ***use*** of more traditional names in that ***language***, which is an attitude worthy of consideration.

Questions nine through thirteen were designed to elicit attitudes via open-ended questions, towards ***English*** or Spanish. The latter being the ***official language*** of the country, and the former the ***language*** under inquiry in this study (see Figure 5).

Figure 5. Quantitative questionnaire: Spanish/***English*** ***language*** selection and attitudes 9. Do you write Spanish? Yes No Somewhat ***English***? Yes No Somewhat 10. Do you express yourself best in Spanish, ***English***, or both?-- 11. With whom do you speak Spanish the most?-- ***English***?-- 12. Where do you speak Spanish the most?-- ***English***?-- 13. Would you like to or do von already speak and write ***English*** well? Yes No

Two more questions were presented to the participants. These last two questions are related to choices and attitudes towards varieties of ***English***. Question number fourteen tries to elicit a choice between the variety of ***English*** spoken in Limon and the ones believed to be the expanding circle varieties in Costa Rica (i.e. British or American ***English***). Question number fifteen is set to elicit attitudes towards the variety spoken in Limon, and ***how*** it is perceived by the respondents (see Figure 6).

Figure 6. Quantitative questionnaire: Attitudes towards specific varieties of ***English*** 14. What type of ***English*** would you like to speak? Limonese American British 15. Do you think that it is important to preserve the ***English*** spoken in Limon as well as the indigenous ***languages***? Yes No Why?--

5.2.2 Qualitative Questionnaire

These qualitative data were gathered through essay-writing in response to written stimuli. Participants were asked to respond to a position-argument ***about*** ***language*** perception, ***language*** policies and globalization. These passages were constructed taking either a negative position committing all of Kachru's (1990) attitudinal sins (see Figure 7) or a positive position calling for the bringing of the inner circle variety to the status of an ***official language*** in Costa Rica (avoiding the sins) (see Figure 8).

Figure 7. Qualitative questionnaire: Scenario 1: Negative position essay towards the inner circle variety I think that ***English*** from the United States should be the only ***English*** ***language*** we should teach to our students. Besides, people do not speak ***English*** in Limon. They speak a sort of a weird dialect that some people called creole, mek-a-tel-you, or patua. It is ugly and it is a bad ***language***. I think we should let it disappear. ***English*** from the United States is the more standard and it will help us to enter into the developed countries arena. So, in reality the only ***English*** we need is the one from the United States. Figure 8. Qualitative questionnaire: Scenario 1: Positive position essay towards the inner circle variety I don't know why people keep saying that in Limon they speak a ***language*** other than ***English***. I am from Heredia and when I go there, I speak ***English*** and every one understands me and I understand them. The only different thing 1 notice from American ***English*** is the accent, but that does not bother me. 1 think we should have more policies to protect ***English*** in Limon and ***make*** it an ***official language*** for Costa Rica as well as Bribri and the other indigenous ***languages***. Parents should teach it to their kids and ask for education in ***English***, all and all, it is

Several known social perceptions were chosen to appear in scenario one because it is expected for such perceptions to trigger strong positive or negative attitudes and points of view towards the statements in it. Scenario one is framed within a negative attitude towards Limonese ***English*** yielding a rich source of attitudes for the analysis.

Scenario two was constructed to trigger strong positive or negative attitudes and positions as well, but it is framed within a very positive attitude towards the relationship of both varieties. The writer is said to be from a part of the country where the expanding circle variety is spoken. It was hoped that this characteristic would trigger perceptions and attitudes towards both varieties spoken in the country. Both scenarios were created to elicit attitudes and perceptions that may not appear in closed-question surveys.

Because people's choices reflect attitudes towards a ***language***, in this case ***English*** or Spanish, participants were given the opportunity to choose between a Spanish version and an ***English*** version of both questionnaires. This also highlights the degree of confidence the participants had towards their ***language*** abilities. Participants were asked to write as much as they would like. The questionnaire is accompanied by a set of instructions guiding participants through the task.

5.3 Data coding and data analysis

Due to the eclectic methodology of this study, all data were analyzed in a succession of steps to provide evidence of reliability of the analyses performed. Thus, results from the quantitative data were compared to results of the qualitative data from the essays. The quantitative data analysis was followed by the qualitative data analysis.

A quantification of questionnaire data was carried out and data were presented in raw scores and percentages form to describe the population (see Table 1 above). Responses given to the quantitative questions of the questionnaire were also tallied. A MANOVA was carried out to detect differences in the responses according to three different dependent variables in the overall essay attitude, type of ***English*** to ***learn***, preservation of LE, and preservation of indigenous ***languages*** as well as the independent variables of gender, age, ethnicity, education, profession, ***language*** spoken, and ***language*** preference. All, but one variable was naturally categorical. Age was divided into three major groups (Group 1= 15-25, Group 2 = 26-25 and Group 3= 50+) to represent three different generations, and to ***make*** easy comparisons with other sociolinguistic studies.

A logistic regression utilizing a VARBRUL analysis through GoldVarb_2001 for Windows was performed. Results from this analysis show factors that predict the source of negative/positive attitudes encountered in the data with their corresponding log-likelihood and significance level. It also provides their probability weights. A probability weight of more than .5 favors/predicts the appearance of the application value set from the dependent variable while weights of less than .5 disfavors/predict the absence of it. This type of analysis has been ***used*** in studies within the variationist sociolinguistic framework (Diaz-Campos, 2003, 2004; Labov, 1972a; 1972b, among others). The information yielded by this type of analysis has helped move the variationist sociolinguistic field forward towards more precise accounts of ***language*** variation and change.

Thus, this type of analysis was selected to be able to quantify attitudes encountered in each of the respondents' essays. Coding was done based on the premise that "a person's attitude towards ***English*** is not necessarily a stable entity" (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 354), and the fact that within each participant's essay, several attitudes may be found. This characteristic of the essay response ***makes*** it difficult to find a unified response within each essay. Accounting for the different attitudes found in each essay is a way to find all possible attitudes held by the participant, both overt and covert. Overt attitudes are defined as those that are clearly marked by the speakers intent and wording of a comment. A covert attitude is defined as those ***used*** as a justification for a specific overt attitude. Covert attitudes are part of the speaker's opinion towards a ***language***. These attitudes represent the population's beliefs towards ***language***. Therefore, a complex system of positive and negative attitudes is expected to be present within each essay. Such complexity may only be accounted for by analyzing each comment separately.

Thus, for this analysis a binomial dependent variable was created. The variable was defined by positive or negative attitude towards Limonese ***English***. Positive attitudes include any comment in favor of Limonese ***English***, any statement putting Limonese ***English*** at the same level as that of American or British ***English***, any clear statement for the preservation of Limonese ***English***, or any cultural comment that favors Limonese ***English***. In opposition to positive attitudes, negative attitudes include any comments in favor of American or British ***English***, any preference for the preservation of indigenous ***languages*** above Limonese ***English***, any comments or descriptions of Limonese ***English*** that are not founded in empirical evidence (i.e. stereotypes), and any negative comment towards the Afro-Costa Rican culture.

The coding of each essay was done in three steps. The first was to identify covert and overt positive and negative attitudes towards the ***language*** within each essay. Attitude stands were grouped as positive or negative. All positive and negative attitudes were counted and totaled. The second step was to analyze each essay to account for distinct positions and beliefs towards ***language*** in order to find an overall positive or negative stand. The score was based on the total number of covert and overt attitudes found via a simple majority method. Essays that had more positive attitudes than negative ones were coded with an overall positive stand and vice versa. In cases where a tie was found, the essay was read one or two more times to account for the speaker's overall intention. The researcher's interpretation of the intention of the participant was the key point to give the final overall essay stand. This categorization serves as a point of departure for the quantification of the attitudes present in an essay. Figure 9 shows an example of the coding scheme ***used*** for each essay.

The third and last step was determining the qualitative nature of each essay. Because of the unique ***language*** situation, and by following the example of Hyrkstedt & Kalaja (1998), essays were categorized into interpretive repertoires. The repertoires were compared to one another in search of dichotomies in the attitudes present in the discourse, and then classified as representing negative or positive attitudes.

Results from the different analyses were ***used*** to account for the interactions of participants' attitudes towards the different varieties of ***English*** in Costa Rica, and ***how*** these social perceptions affect their view of each one.

6. Results

6.1 Quantitative analyses

Each of the following analyses is accompanied by a description of the variables and their coding with results presented accordingly.

6.1.1 Name/Pseudonym

Due to the substantial amount of missing data with respect to the name/pseudonym variable, no analysis could be carried out. However, an overview of the responses shows that participants often chose names related to their real names or popular nicknames that show no ***language***-related preference.

6.1.2 MANOVA

Four dependent variables were included in this analysis. The first was the overall essay attitude. The second was the ***language*** in which the participant would like to receive further education. The third was LE preservation. This third variable indicates whether participants support the preservation of Limonese ***English*** or not. The fourth variable was Indigenous ***Languages*** preservation. As with variable three, this variable shows whether or not the participant supports indigenous ***languages*** preservation. The independent variables included in this analysis were gender, age, ethnic group, education, profession, spoken ***language*** and ***language*** preference (see Table 2 above for details).

The MANOVA analysis yielded the following results: significant differences among groups were found for age (F= 2.788; df= 8, 158; p= .006), for education (F= 3.225; df= 8, 158; p= .002), for profession (F= 1.695; df= 20, 324; p= .033), for spoken ***language*** (F= 2.630; df= 4, 78; p= .041), and for the interaction of education and ***language*** preference (F= 2.489; df= 8, 158; p= .014).

The effects of the test between subjects reveal that with age the only significant differences are found in the dependent variables overall essay attitude (F= 3.571; df= 2; p= .033) and for the preservation of LE (F= 7.089; df= 2; p= .001). In these groups, it was found that the age group 2 (26-50) behaves differently than groups 1 (15-25) and 3 (50+). Group 2 carries more negative attitudes towards Limonese ***English*** than those of the other groups (see Table 2).

In terms of the LE preservation by age group, these data show that age groups 1 and 2 are significantly different from one another (p= .001), but neither is significantly different from group 3. Age group 2 also shows a negative attitude (***about*** 20%) towards the preservation of Limonese ***English***. Table 3 shows the preference, by age group, for the LE preservation.

The level of education had a significant effect on Indigenous ***Languages*** Preservation (F = 6.809; df = 2; p = .002). Table 4 shows that people who had only attended primary school held negative attitudes towards the preservation of indigenous ***languages*** while people with a university background registered a lower percentage of negative attitudes towards the preservation of indigenous ***languages***.

The profession of the participants also revealed significant differences for the dependent variables LE preservation (F= 2.814; df= 5; p= .022) and for indigenous ***language*** preservation (F= 2.928; df= 5; p= .018). These results show that indigenous ***languages*** attracted a more positive attitude than Limonese ***English***.

Tables 5 and 6 provide evidence for ***how*** Limonese ***English*** is subject to more negative attitudes than indigenous ***languages*** by people in the professions as well as those in services, farming, and even students whereas indigenous ***language*** preservation is subject to more support from these same groups with the exception of services and farmers, which show a low percentage of negative answers.

Spoken ***Language*** was also a source of significant differences. Differences are found only for the dependent variables overall essay attitudes (F= 6.799; df= 1; p= .011) and for the indigenous ***language*** preservation (F= 4.224; df= 1; p= .043). Table 7 shows ***how*** monolingual Spanish speakers hold more negative attitude towards Limonese ***English*** than bilinguals.

Table 8 shows ***how*** monolingual Spanish speakers tend to disfavor the preservation of indigenous ***languages*** while bilinguals have a more favorable attitude towards it.

A significant interaction was found between age and education (F= 3.906; df= 3; p= .012) and between education and ***language*** preference (F= 6.382; df= 2; p= .003) regarding LE preservation. The first interaction may be attributed to the stereotypes embedded within the Costa Rican society ***about*** Limonese ***English*** and the lack of linguistic knowledge in the community. The second may be attributed to the fact that the higher the level of education, the more an individual is in contact with the outer-circle varieties, the more negative attitudes towards the lesser known variety are evident, as pointed out in previous studies (Herzfeld, 2004; Winkler, 1999). Independent variables such as gender or ethnic group did not yield significant differences in the responses. Nor were there any significant differences on participant responses related to the ***language*** of the questionnaire chosen. In sum, attitudes toward Limonese ***English*** are varied and come from diverse sources. Table 9 summarizes the following MANOVA results.

6.1.3 Binomial Logistic Regression

Social variables also help predict positive or negative attitudes toward Limonese ***English***. To determine which social variables will help predict positive or negative attitudes toward Limonese ***English***, a logistic regression with the dependent variable defined as positive or negative attitudes was conducted. Every case was accounted for from each of the covert and overt variables found in the essays.

Seven social independent variables were entered, including gender, age, ethnic group, education, profession, ***language*** spoken, and ***language*** preference.

The VARBRUL analysis was carried out with a negative attitude as the application value. A total of 623 tokens were entered in the regression. From these 623, 211 or 33.33%, were tokens of negative attitudes and 412 (66.66%) were tokens of positive attitudes. All seven independent variables were introduced into the regression analysis. From these seven social variables five were chosen as predictive groups while two others were eliminated in the process with a Log likelihood of -362.879 and a significance level of .005. The variables eliminated in the process were ethnic group and profession. The variables chosen as predictors were, in order of importance, gender, age, education, spoken ***language***, and ***language*** preference. These results are similar to those found in the MANOVA analysis as ethnic group seems unrelated to negative attitudes toward Limonese ***English***.

The variable gender was selected as the first predictor. In this analysis males favored negative attitudes towards LE with a probabilistic weight of .613 and females disfavored them with a weight of .460. This finding contradicts those in the sociolinguistic field because women tend to be more conservative when it comes to ***language*** change. However, in this case the attitude towards the spoken ***language*** was being discussed in the community, and women frequently identify more with their local community than men since they are the ones who spend more time in community activities such as PTA meetings, religious functions, and preparations for local festivities while men tend to be exposed to the other varieties through the job market. That said, this issue requires further investigation. In a sense, it can be claimed that conservatism as shown here is an overall desire for ***language*** maintenance.

Age was selected as the second most important factor. As with the results from the MANOVA analysis, the regression age group 1 (15-25) disfavored negative attitudes with a probabilistic weight of .188, followed by age

group 2 (26-50), which favored negative attitudes with a weight of .590, and group 3 (50+), which disfavored negative attitudes with a weight of .470.

Education was the third variable to be selected as a predictor. In this group, people with a secondary level of education disfavored negative attitudes toward Limonese ***English*** with a probabilistic weight of .300 while people with only a primary level of education favored negative attitudes with a weight of .843, and whereas people with a university education favored negative attitudes with a weight of .525, the people with no education disfavored negative attitudes with a weight of .305.

The fourth group was spoken ***language***. People who spoke Spanish only favored negative attitudes toward Limonese ***English*** whereas people who spoke Spanish and ***languages*** other than ***English*** disfavored negative attitudes with a weight of .266 alongside people who speak Spanish and ***English*** who also tended to disfavor negative attitudes towards Limonese ***English*** with a weight of .432. These results resemble those found in the MANOVA.

The last variable to be selected was ***language*** preference. People who preferred to express themselves in Spanish disfavored (i.e. did not have) negative attitudes with a weight of .435. Bilinguals tended to favor (i.e. have) negative attitudes with a weight of .563. And, people who preferred ***English*** to express themselves favored (i.e. have) negative attitudes with a weight of .773.

Because the results in both analyses patterns are similar, they are ***used*** as evidence for the reliability of the coding and the validity of the qualitative results that are presented in the following sections.

6.2 Qualitative Analyses: Attitude Repertoires?

Some of these repertoires appear in both negative and positive versions. This was done because the attitudes under study examine two varieties of ***English***, and because there are other ***languages*** involved in this contact situation (i.e. Spanish, Chinese, and indigenous ***languages***).

For negative attitudes seven repertoires emerged. The first one was the minimizer repertoire. In this repertoire the person did not mention Limonese ***English*** at all and tended to avoid talking ***about*** it.

Example: Es muy importante hablar el ingles porque costa Rica es muy visitado por Extranjeros y debemos aprender tanto los adultos como los ninos para asi poder defendernos en el turismo. Participant: M3NS It is very important to speak ***English*** because Costa Rica is widely visited by foreigners and both adults and children must ***learn*** to be able to work in the tourist industry (my translation).

The second repertoire is the utilitarian. In this repertoire, the person talks ***about*** the advantages of ***using*** American or British ***English*** as a means for social mobility and job opportunities.

Example: ***English*** in fact is a ***language*** that help us to enter into the arena of the develop countries but it is no the most important ***language*** and our education should not be in ***English*** because our ***language*** is Spanish and if we want we can ***learn*** a new ***language***. Participant: M1NB

The third is the assimilationist repertoire. Members of this repertoire tend to advocate the assimilation to either American ***English*** or British ***English***.

Example: Creo que el ingles de los Estados Unidos debera ser la unica lengua inglesa que deberiamos ensenar a nuestros estudiantes. Ademas, la gente no habla ingles en Limon. Participant: F2NS I believe that American ***English*** should be the only ***English language*** we teach our students. Besides, people do not speak ***English*** in Limon (my translation).

The fourth repertoire is the negative linguist. Members of this group gave a detailed explanation of why Limonese ***English*** is not a ***language*** and why it could never be considered a ***language***.

Example: Personally the first scenario shows a person overwhelmed by the American ***language*** and culture, someone whom I would say is in a way a racist person in the way he donnot accept other ***languages*** rather then ***English***, American ***English*** is the most spoken ***English*** in America, but if we look next door, British ***English*** is widely spoken in Europe, so I don't think american Eng. should be the only ***language*** to teach at school besides, it is not well taught. Finally ***just*** to have in mind that every single ***English*** spoken country has its dialectal variations and changes in pronunciation, semantic & grammar, a standard ***English*** is the one that combiened let us communicate w/ others. Participant: M1NB

The fifth repertoire is the negative anthropologist. Like the negative linguist, members of this repertoire tended to give detailed explanations of the origins of Limonese

English and its culture and why it cannot be considered a ***language*** because it is part of a very small group of people.

Example: It is not that in Limon they speak a ***language*** other than ***English***, is ***just*** that the younger or the youth of these days don't like to speak ***English***, and their parents don't speak to them in ***English*** and that's why this kind of creole speaking is in Limon. It would be good to teach them the way to get interested in ***learning*** ***English***. The American one or the British one (***English***) so as to develop their knowledge in the ***language***. Participant: F2BB

The sixth repertoire is the negative practitioner. Members of this group tended to think that even though they speak Limonese ***English***, they should not continue to ***use*** it or teach it because it is not proper ***language***.

Example: Well, I really believe that our students should ***learn*** as much as they can. Teachers should teach different types of ***English*** at the same time because it is no fair that students only study things that appear on a simple book or teachers first explain a couple of basic structures in ***English***. ***English*** is so wide and its is going to be better for them and us to ***make*** a variety of knowledges from different countries, but speaking of Limon I dare to think, that they have to study more speak better, and going deeply on the ***language*** because "patois" is a dialect and most of "Limonenses" only understand what they speak each other, they do not know ***how*** to write in ***English*** ***correctly*** that's my opinion. ***English*** is a fantastic thing. It is very nice to ***use*** it and speak in a good way but I think as much as a person can ***learn*** it it would be easy to practice it for the rest of his/her life. That's my point of vew. Thanks. Participant: M1NB

The last repertoire is the isolationist. Members of this group believed that Limonese ***English*** should stay in Limon and that people should only speak it with their relatives or people of the same race.

Example: Standard ***English*** is the one that should be thought in our country. These kind of ***languages*** like patua or bribri should be kept too, but ***just*** for the people that live there and have to deal with it every day. I have heard people from Limon ***using*** their ***language*** and I have not been able to understand what they say. I also know that it is very difficult for these people to speak standard ***English*** in a proper way. Therefore I think it should be kept ***just*** in Limon. Participant: M1NB

For positive attitudes towards Limonese ***English***, eight repertoires emerged. The first one was the equalizer. Members of this group tended to equalize, at all levels, Limonese ***English*** to any other variety of ***English***.

Example: El ingles como se le conoce patua como el hablado en Limon C. R. No deberia desaparecer o cambiarse por cuanto es parte de la cultura de esta Pequena Provincia. A Lo a mi parecer lo que deberia enriquecerse mediante talleres o cursos y ademas por ser criollo o lo que entiendo no se conjuga verbos a diferencia del Ingles Americano. Participant: M2NS

English as we know it, and patua like the one spoken in Limon C.R., should not disappear or change due to the fact that it is part of the culture of that Little Province. To my understanding what we should do is to enrich it through workshops or courses and in addition, because it is a Creole, and from what I understand verbs are not conjugated, which is different from American ***English*** (my translation).

The second repertoire is the conservationist who advocates for the preservation of Limonese ***English*** as a national and cultural icon.

Example: I'm totally agree with paragraph #2 because it is completely important to keep all the aspects with Costa Rican culture, however if we wan to survive nowadays we must speak north American ***English***, because enough institutions ask for that ***language***. For me it is too sad that every day our own ***language*** loses its importance; that's why we need to work hard for preserving our roots. The United States is part of the world, no the world. Participant: M1NB

The third positive repertoire is the positive anthropologist who advocates for the status of Limonese ***English*** as a ***language*** because of the history of its speakers.

Example: Well in my Personal opinion I think that United Stated ***English*** shouldn't be the only ***language*** because sometimes their don't speak the correct ***language***. Our dialect that some people called creole should always be their because is our culture but It is very important to ***learn*** the appropriate ***language*** that is not American ***language***. Participant: F1BB

The fourth repertoire is the nationalist who advocates for the officialization of Limonese ***English*** as a national ***language***.

Example: I agree with the second paragraph, because it is incredible that as American as "ticos" we don't know our ***languages*** as well as we suppose to speak ***English*** some day. In fact, the government could implement a program related with the ***use*** and ways for ***how*** to ***learn*** Limonese ***language***, and most of our national ***languages***. Participant: F1NB

The fifth repertoire is the positive linguist who explains why Limonese ***English*** is a ***language*** like any other ***language***; this repertoire is different from that of the equalizer because the person in this repertoire gives detailed linguistic descriptions of Limonese ***English***.

Example: I am concerned with the fact that what is spoken in Limon is a dialect. It is true is part of the ***English language***, but they have their own characteristics as it or they have as a social dialect. In C.R. people ***use*** to diminish their dialect, and say that what they are spoken is not ***English***, but in fact they ignore the fact that it is a dialect. Participant: M2NB

The sixth repertoire is the positive practitioner who is proud to speak and teach Limonese ***English*** to the younger generations.

Example: I totally agree with paragraph #2 while I was reading paragraph #1, I was completely upset. I don't know why there are people who want to eliminate the way Limonese speak. I have a boyfriend who is from Limon, and I speak with him in ***English***. I understand every word he says, we don't have problems to communicate in ***English***, I think that paragraph #1 is ***just*** an unfair way of demonstrate discrimination against black people. Definitely, Limonese must keep the way they speak. They've to preserve their roots. Participant: F1NB

The seventh repertoire is the activist who advocates for the rights of Limonese ***English*** speakers in order to avoid discrimination.

Example: You must take into account diversity in your perspective. The way you ***learn*** to speak certain dialect is kind of a cultural legacy. It is not good to globalize the different dialects of ***English***. In addition, there is not necessary to describe the creole, patua or mek-a-tel-you as ugly or bad ***language***. There are differences to respect, to understand and support. Participant: F1NB

The last repertoire is the educator who advocates for the teaching of Limonese ***English*** to all children and at all levels of the educational system.

Example: I'm from Limon, and I think way for from disappearing ***language***, it would be nice to study ***about*** this, because its part of our culture, if we do this we will be killing our past and been disrespectful to our ancestors. Our students should know and have the understanding that they are way to communicate, so there is no ugliness in speaking X ***language***; for this we will have to disappear a lot of ***languages***. We must respect each other for what we have. If there could be a way to teach proper Inglish, what is proper Inglish? American, Ingland? ***Just*** for development defenetly we should teach the American Inglish; way? because it is a commercial ***language*** all of the world. Participant: F3BB

Table 10 below shows the tabulation of the repertoires and the distribution of participants' responses.

As can be seen from the distribution of the repertoires, negative attitudes toward Limonese ***English*** surface in relationship to the ***use*** of American and British ***English*** in Costa Rican society. Because of the high status of American and British ***English***, Limonese ***English*** is classified as non-useful. At the same time, positive attitudes are present in society by those who are trying to elevate Limonese ***English*** to the same status of American and British ***English***, and ***make*** it a link to the cultural and linguistical heritage of Costa Rica. Preserving it is also seen as a symbol of equality by the speakers of Limonese ***English***.

7. Discussion

To study the attitudes towards these two varieties of ***English*** from the perspective of those who speak both, two research questions had to be asked. The first addressed the social perception of the inner circle variety of ***English*** in Limon as well as the expanding circle variety of ***English*** in the rest of the country to ascertain the attitudes towards these varieties. The second question was whether this social perception resembled the global tendency towards the preference for traditional inner circle varieties (i.e. American or British ***English***).

The results of this study suggest that Limonese ***English*** is still regarded as an inferior ***language*** by Costa Ricans whereas the ***use*** of British and American ***English*** is regarded as important for upward mobility and success. However, Limonese ***English***, as can be seen from the generation data on usage places for ***English***, and the fact that ***about*** 20% (the largest number) of the essays fall into the equalizer repertoire, is regaining the terrain it once had and is being elevated to the status of an authentic ***language*** by its speakers. This may be triggered by the insertion of a lexicalizing variety (i.e. academic ***English***), which benefits the native speakers of ***English*** in the region, and seems to be revitalizing the variety of ***English*** spoken in Limon. A wider linguistic understanding of the ***language*** situation in Limon seems to be growing as a side effect of the introduction of the inner circle varieties for success in the job market. A closer look at the responses to the questions where ***English*** is ***used*** the most and by whom suggests there is evidence for the proposal of a revitalization of Limonese ***English***. In figures 10 and 11, this propensity by ethnic groups can be observed. Afro-Costa Ricans seem to be ***using*** Limonese ***English*** in more places and with more people than those reported in previous studies (e.g. Herzfeld, 2004; Winkler, 1999) where it was believed that Limonese ***English*** was ***used*** strictly at home and for same-race exchanges.

The natural inclination to adopt traditional inner circle varieties for their prestige is present in this context since American and British ***English*** enjoy a higher status than Limonese ***English***. Furthermore, they are endorsed by the governmental educational policies.

This study serves as evidence in response to Spence's (1993) predictions of the future of Limonese ***English***. She postulated two predictions: the total loss of Limonese ***English*** and the reverse bilingualism where ***English*** takes the place of a second ***language***. Evidence presented here shows that besides reverse bilingualism, a revitalization of Limonese ***English*** as a first ***language*** is taking place and that people are becoming more aware of the importance of their native tongue.

Furthermore, ethnic group membership does not seem to be a factor that influences ***language*** attitudes. However, social factors such as gender, age, education, spoken ***language***, and profession do seem to be strong predictors of negative ***language*** attitudes. This may be attributed to the lack of linguistic knowledge that has been prominent in Costa Rica due to monolingual education policies, and the low social status Limonese ***English*** acquired after all government-sponsored schooling became Spanish only.

8. Conclusion

The present study was motivated by Ladegaard's (2000) call for the ***use*** of eclectic methods, which argue that a positive correlation in the quantitative data, as well as a positive relationship between open-ended responses and sociolinguistic behavior, would provide the ultimate support for the tripartite model; and by Hyrkstedt's & Kalaja's (1998) call for a change in the collection of data and its subsequent analysis. It was decided to ***use*** an instrument that includes both quantitative data and qualitative discourse responses to written stimuli and methodology, and which includes both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. This eclectic method has proven to be a powerful tool for the understanding of ***language*** attitudes at a microlevel (Costa Rica), and it could be extrapolated that its ***use*** at the macro-level for the study of ***language*** attitudes among other qualitative data would be equally effective.

As pointed out previously in this study, the study of ***language*** attitudes is found in two different primary fields of inquiry, social psychology and sociolinguistics. In social psychology, attitudes are studied from the perspective of the importance of perception, which is the foundation of all social constructions, individual and group relationships. Perception reflects the accumulated social knowledge individuals carry with them. An example of these attitudes is when people see dialects as "better" or "worse." This study is an example of ***how*** attitudes can be found and quantified by studying the various comments regarding a ***language*** that are present in an essay. The results reveal ***how*** the perceptions of a society towards its ***language***(s) are sometimes hard to pinpoint. The methodology presented here helps to bring these covert attitudes to light by employing a deeper analysis of participants' essays.

Some of the limitations of the present study are due to the fact that the data collected were written, and participants had a short amount of time to answer. Another limitation is that the sample may not be representative of the population at large. The focus group of the present study was principally prospective and in-service ***English*** teachers as well as people from varying professions. However, this sampling serves as a starting point for future studies. Future research should focus on the study of ***language*** attitudes found in speech, as well as other types of narratives.

Concerning sociolinguistics, Limonese ***English*** seems to be shifting away from its status as a forgotten or limited ***language*** to a ***language*** whose ***use*** may benefit the community both culturally and economically. Culturally, it benefits the community because it may trigger a total revitalization of the ***English*** variety found in Limon and its adoption as the ***language*** of everyday ***use*** alongside Spanish. Economically, it helps because this revitalization of Limonese ***English*** and current level of access to the standardized variety through education could help people enter the work force in tourism and other industries like call center management and pharmaceutical manufacturing, which have found a potential source of workers in the region.

Hopefully, the results of this work will shed light on the importance of why governments should change and adopt policies that are based on empirical evidence of the linguistic situation of their countries. The gap between research and the real world can be bridged, and erroneous assumptions ***about languages*** can be avoided. It is also hoped that this study will serve as a foundation for the construction of such a bridge. Finally, for researchers seeking to study/describe complex linguistic contexts such as the one found in Limon, the present work provides a framework for the understanding of ***how*** communities perceive their linguistic situation. Such an understanding leads to the uncovering of covert characteristics of their ***language*** that may be hidden behind speakers' attitudes.

Notes

(1.) Thanks to Dan McNeely for all his help throughout this project, Adriana Aguilar-Sanchez and Ivannia Ugalde Hernandez for their help with the data collection, and to all the people of Limon for their great welcome to these types of projects. And, to Beverly Hartford for her insightful comments and for introducing the field of World Englishes to me.

(2.) For more information on methods for the study of ***language*** attitudes, see Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998.

(3.) Small grocery store.

(4.) Purcell calls it Limon Creole [a term not ***used*** here due to its negative connotation among non-linguists].

(5.) For more information on the Caribbean Creole continua, see Windford, 1997.

Doi: https://doi.org/10.15517/rfl.v44i2.34693

References

Aguilar-Sanchez, J. (2005). ***English*** in Costa Rica. World Englishes, 24 (2), 161-172.

Battenburg, J. (1997). ***English*** versus French: ***Language*** Rivalry in Tunisia. World Englishes, 16 (2), 281-290.

Bell, J. (2013). ***Language*** attitudes and ***language*** revival/survival. Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 34 (4), 399-410. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2013.794812

Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: issues in modeling ***English*** worldwide. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13 (2), 159-178. doi: 10.1111/1473-4192.00042

Bryce-Laporte, R. S. (1962). Social relations and cultural persistence (or change) among Jamaicans in a rural area of Costa Rica. (Doctor of Philosophy). University of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico.

Cabrera, L., & Ancker, W. (1997). ***English*** ***language*** education in Costa Rica. Retrieved from http://www.tesol.org/isaffi/affil/profiles/costarica.html (archived)

Chakrani, B., & Huang, J. L. (2014). The work of ideology: examining class, ***language*** ***use***, and attitudes among Moroccan university students. International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism, 17 (1), 1-14. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2012.718319

Cherciov, M. (2013). Investigating the impact of attitude on first ***language*** attrition and second ***language*** acquisition from a Dynamic Systems Theory perspective. International Journal of Bilingualism, 17 (6), 716-733. doi:10.1177/1367006912454622

Choi, J. K. (2003). ***Language*** Attitudes and the Future of Bilingualism: The Case of Paraguay. International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism, 6 (2), 81-94.

Crezee, I. (2012). ***Language*** shift and host society attitudes: Dutch migrants who arrived in New Zealand between 1950 and 1965. International Journal of Bilingualism, 16 (4), 528-540. doi: 10.1177/1367006911429523

Diaz-Campos, M. (2003). The pluralization of haber in Venezuelan Spanish: A sociolinguistic change in real time. IU Working Papers in Linguistics, 3, 175-187.

Diaz-Campos, M. (2004). Acquisition of Sociolinguistic Variables in Spanish: Do Children Acquire Individual Lexical Forms or Variable Rules? In T. L. Face (Ed.). Laboratory Approaches to Spanish Phonology, (pp. 221-236). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dowling, J. A., Ellison, C. G., & Leal, D. L. (2012). Who Doesn't Value ***English***? Debunking Myths ***About*** Mexican Immigrants' Attitudes Toward the ***English*** ***Language****. Social Science Quarterly (Wiley-Blackwell), 93 (2), 356-378. doi:10.1111/j.15406237.2012.00850.x

Edwards, J. (1999). Refining Our Understanding of ***Language*** Attitudes. Journal of ***Language*** & Social Psychology, 18 (1), 101.

Friedrich, P. (2000). ***English*** in Brazil: functions and attitudes. World Englishes, 19 (2), 215.

Garrett, P. (2001). ***Language*** attitudes and sociolinguistics. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 5 (4), 626-631. doi: 10.1111/1467-9481.00171

Gonzalez-Riano, X., Hevia-Artime, I., & Fernandez-Costales, A. (2013). ***Language*** attitudes of Asturian students in the area of Navia-Eo (Spain). ***Language*** & Intercultural Communication, 13 (4), 450-469. doi:10.1080/14708477.2013.785558

Herzfeld, A. (1978). Bilingual Instability as a Result of Government Induced Policies. Retrieved from https://libweb.uwlax.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct =true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=eric&AN=ED159921&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Herzfeld, A. (1980). Bilingual Instability as a Result of Government Induced Policies. ITL: Review of Applied Linguistics, 48, 3-20.

Herzfeld, A. (1983). Limon Creole and Panamanian Creole: Comparison and Contrast. In L. D. Carrington, D. Craig, & R. T Dandare (Eds.). Studies in Caribbean ***Language***. (pp. 23-37). St. Augustine, Trinidad: Soc. for Caribbean Ling.

Herzfeld, A. (2004). Mekaytelyu: la lengua criolla de Limon. San Jose: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica.

Hyrkstedt, I., & Kalaja, P. (1998). Attitudes toward ***English*** and its functions in Finland: A discourse-analytic study. World Englishes, 17 (3), 345.

Infocostarica. (2000). Education in Costa Rica. Retrieved from http://www.infocostarica.com/ education/education. html (archived)

Kachru, B. B. (1984). World Englishes and the teaching of ***English*** to non-native speakers, contexts, attitudes, and concerns. TESOL Newsletter, 18, 25-26.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realm: The ***English language*** in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.). ***English*** in the World. (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1990). Native and non-native norms. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.). The Alchemy of ***English***. (pp. 100-114). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kalaja, P. (1997). ***Language*** attitudes reconsidered: from cognitive representations to discursive construction. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics Annual Conference, Orlando, FL.

Labov, W. (1972a). On the Mechanism of Linguistic Change. In W. Labov (Ed.). Sociolinguistic Patterns. (pp. 167-182). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. (1972b). Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ladegaard, H. J. (2000). ***Language*** attitudes and sociolinguistic behaviour: Exploring attitudebehaviour relations in ***language***. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4 (2), 214-233.

Lazarus, D. (2002). Universities and Private ***Language*** Schools. Retrieved from http://www. fortunecity. com/athena/exercise/2445/id19_m. html (archived)

Melendez Chaverri, C., & Duncan, Q. (1974). El negro en Costa Rica: antologia (2. ed.). San Jose: Editorial Costa Rica.

Niedzielski, N. A., & Preston, D. R. (2000). Folk Linguistics. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Purcell, T. W. (1993). Banana fallout: class, color, and culture among West Indians in Costa Rica. Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies, University of California.

Purnell, T., Idsardi, W., & Baugh, J. (1999). Perceptual and Phonetic Experiments on American ***English*** Dialect Identification. Journal of ***Language*** and Social Psychology, 18 (1), 10-30. doi: 10.1177/0261927X99018001002

Sallabank, J. (2013). Can majority support save an endangered ***language***? A case study of ***language*** attitudes in Guernsey. 34, 332-347. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2013.794808

Simms, E. G. (1990). Un analisis sociolinguistico de las esferas de uso del ingle's de Limon en hablantes que residen en San Jose, Costa Rica y algunas actitudes de los hablantes y de los descendientes de hablantes de ingles de Limon, que no lo hablan, con respecto a esta lengua. (Master's Thesis), Universidad de Costa Rica, San Jose, Costa Rica.

Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2018a). Costa Rica ***Languages***: Map. In G. F. Simons & C. D. Fennig (Eds.). Ethnologue: ***Languages*** of the World. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Retrieved from https://www.ethnologue.com/country/CR/maps

Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2018b). Costa Rica: ***Languages***. In G. F. Simons & C. D. Fennig (Eds.). Ethnologue: ***Languages*** of the World. (21 ed.). Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Retrieved from https://www.ethnologue.com/country/CR/***languages***

Simpson, J. (2013). What's done and what's said: ***language*** attitudes, public ***language*** activities and everyday talk in the Northern Territory of Australia. Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 34 (4), 383-398. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2013.794811

Spence, M. J. (1993). A Case Study of ***Language*** Shift in Progress in Port Limon, Costa Rica. (Doctor of Philosophy), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&res_dat=xri:pqdiss&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:9410349

Thomason, S. G. (2001). ***Language*** contact. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Thumboo, E. (2003). Closed and open attitudes to globalised ***English***: notes on issues. World Englishes, 22 (3), 233-243. doi: 10.1111/1467-971X.00293

Winford, D. (1997). Re-Examining Caribbean ***English*** Creole Continua. World Englishes, 16 (2), 233-279.

Winkler, E. G. (1999). Limonese Creole: A Case of Contact-Induced ***Language*** Change. (Doctor of Philosophy). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Jorge Aguilar-Sanchez

PhD. Jorge Aguilar Sanchez. University of Dayton. Assistant Professor of Spanish Linguistics. USA. Correo electronico: jaguilarsanchez1@udayton.edu

Recepcion: 07-12-2017

Aceptacion: 17-03-2018

Caption: Figure 1. Province of Limon and ***languages*** found in it (Simmons & Fennig, 2018a, 2018b)

Caption: Figure 2. ***Language*** Varieties found in Limon (indigenous ***languages*** excluded)

Caption: Figure 3. Contact situation found in Limon (indigenous ***languages*** excluded)

Caption: Figure 9. Coding scheme sample

Caption: Figure 10. Places of LE usage by race

Caption: Figure 11. Interlocutor type of LE usage by race

Table 1. Distribution of participants by demographic data Description Total n % Gender Female 81 74.3 Male 28 25.7 Total 109 100.0 Place of Residence Limon 47 43. 1 Other 62 56.9 Total 109 100.0 Auc Group 1 : 1 5-25 46 42.2 Group 2: 26-50 56 5 1.4 Group 3: 50+ 7 6.4 Total 109 100.0 Ethnic Group Afro-Costa Rican 21 1 9.3 Mestizo 9 X.3 Other 79 72.5 Total 109 100.0 Education Level Higher Education 88 80.7 Secondary Education 1 6 14.7 Primary Education 4 3.7 none 1 0.9 Total 109 100.0 Profession Services 28 25.7 Home 1 0.9 Business 3 2.8 Education 1 5 1 3.8 Student 58 53.2 Farm I 0.9 N/A 3 2.8 Total 109 100.0 Lanauaues Spoken Spanish only 30 27.5 ***English*** and Spanish 77 70.6 Spanish and other 1 0.9 N/A 1 0.9 Total 109 100.0 ***Language*** Preference Spanish 68 62.4 ***English*** 4 3.7 Both 37 33.9 Total 109 100.0 Table 2. Overall Essay Attitudes by Age Group Dependent Variable Independent Over-all Essay Attitude Variable Positive Negative Total 11 % n % 11 % Age Group 1 = 37 50.00% 9 25.71% 46 42.20% 15-25 Group 2 = 31 41.89% 25 71.43% 56 51.38% 26-50 Group 3 = 6 8.11% 1 2.86% 7 6.42% 50+ Total 74 100.00% 35 100.00% 109 100.00% Table 3. LE Preservation by Age Group Dependent Variable Independent LE Preservation Variables Positive Negative Total n % n % n % Age 15-25 46 46.94% 0 0.00% 46 42.59% 26-50 45 45.92% 10 100.00% 55 50.93% 50+ 7 7.14% 0 0.00% 7 6.48% Total 98 100.00% 10 100.00% 108 100.00% Table 4. Indigenous ***Language*** Preservation by Age Group Independent Dependent Variable Variables Indigenous ***Languages*** Preservation Yes No Total n % n % n % Education Primary only 3 2.97% 2 33.33% 5 4.67% Secondary only 16 15.84% 0 0.00% 16 14.95% University 82 81.19% 4 66.67% 86 80.37% Total 101 100.00% 6 100.00% 107 100.00% Table 5. LE Preservation by Profession Dependent Variable Independent LE Preservation Variables Yes No Total n % n % n % Profession Services 20 20.41% 7 70.00% 27 25.00% Business 2 2.04% 1 10,00% 3 2.78% Education 15 15.31% 0 0.00% 15 13.89% Farmer 2 2.04% 0 0.00% 2 1.85% Student 57 58.16% 1 10.00% 58 53.70% n/a 2 2.04% 1 10.00% 3 2.78% Total 98 100.00% 10 100.00% 108 100.00% Table 6. Indigenous ***Languages*** Preservation by Profession Dependent Variable Independent Indigenous ***Languages*** Preservation Variables Yes No Total n % n % n % Profession Services 22 21.78% 5 83.33% 27 25,23% Business 3 2.97% 0 0.00% 3 2.80% Education 15 14.85% 0 0.00% 15 14.02% Farmer 2 1.98% 0 0.00% 2 1.87% Student 56 55.45% 1 16.67% 57 53.27% n/a 3 2.97% 0 0.00% 3 2.80% Total 101 100.00% 6 100.00% 107 100.00% Table 7. Overall Essay Attitudes by Spoken ***Language*** Independent Dependent Variable Variable Over-all Essay Atlitude Positive Negative Total n % n % n % ***Language*** Spoken Spanish Only 12 16.22% 19 54.29% 31 28,44% Spanish and ***English*** 62 83.78% 16 45.71% 78 71.56% Total 74 100.00% 35 100.00% 109 100.00% Table 8. Indigenous ***Language*** Preservation by ***Language*** Spoken Independent Dependent Variable Variables Indigenous ***Languages*** Preservation Yes No Total n % n % n % ***Language*** Spoken Spanish Only 25 24.75% 5 83.33% 30 28.04% Spanish and 76 75.25% 1 16.67% 77 71.96% ***English*** Total 101 100.00% 6 100.00% 107 100.00% Table 9. MANOVA Results Dependent Variables and Interactions Independent ***Language*** LE Indigenous Variable Attitudes Type Preservation ***Language*** preservation Age * * Gender Ethnic group Education * Profession * * ***Language*** Spoken * * ***Language*** Preference * significant differences Significant interactions: Age and Education; Education and ***Language*** preference Table 10. Distribution of Essays by Repertoires Attitude Repertoire n (a) % Negative minimizer 3 2.75 utilitarian 14 12.84 assimilationist 9 8.26 linguist negative 4 3.67 anthropologist negative 4 3.67 practioner negative 1 0.92 isolationist 1 0.92 Positive equalizer 21 19.27 conservationist 13 11.93 anthropologist positive 8 7,34 officialist 2 1.83 linguist positive 7 6.42 practioner positive 7 6.42 activist 11 10.09 educator 4 3.67 Total 109 100.00 (a) Number of essays categorized as each repertoire

Classification

Language*: *ENGLISH

Publication-Type: Other, Magazine/Journal

Journal Code: 0PNG

Acc-No: 568726294

Subject: LINGUISTICS (90%); ***LANGUAGE*** & ***LANGUAGES*** (89%); APPLIED LINGUISTICS (75%); PSYCHOLOGY (73%); NATIONAL ORIGIN DISCRIMINATION (71%); RESEARCH REPORTS (71%); DISCRIMINATION (65%); AFRICAN AMERICANS (65%); HISPANIC AMERICANS (60%)

Industry: RENTAL PROPERTY (84%); PSYCHOLOGY (73%)

Geographic: COSTA RICA (72%)

Load-Date: February 28, 2019

End of Document