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Abstract

The present study aims to determine self-perceptions of three groups of adult EFL learners on language learning strategies and evaluate the relationship between variables such as gender and age of the learners, their level, type of the high schools the learners graduated, and the strategies used by the students in the foreign language learning process. In order to gather data, “Strategy Inventory for Language Learning” (SILL) questionnaire developed by Oxford was applied to 185 randomly-selected participants attending in preparatory classes at Pamukkale University from different levels ranging from elementary to intermediate levels.

Overall findings indicate that adult EFL learners have a moderate use of language learning strategies, and the highest strategy use is meta-cognitive strategies, while the lowest strategy used by the participants is affective strategy. On the other hand, it can be concluded from the research that as the proficiency level of the learners rises, their strategy use rises, as well. Although there is no meaningful difference between female and male learners, the results regarding with high schools the learners graduated have a meaningful difference.

Keywords: learning strategies, language learning, strategy use, adult learners, preparatory classes

1. Introduction

There has been a great change in the field of language learning from teachers and teaching into learning and learner. In parallel to this change in language teaching, studies on the role of the learner throughout the learning process has increased especially after the acceptance of a language approach focusing on the communication (Demirel, 2009). The most prominent concern for researchers who study in the field of EFL/ESL has been the process of gathering new information on individual differences affecting the process in learning a new language. As Cook (2001) mentions, language learners vary in terms of factors such as: aptitudes, demographic variables, affective variables, learning styles and learning strategies when they start learning the second language (cited in Abhakorn, 2008: 2). Among other variables related to individual differences, the term "learner strategies" generally refers to learners' consciously selected processes. According to Oxford (2001), strategies are the specific behaviors or thoughts which learners employ to enhance learning. What turns an ordinary learning activity into a learning strategy is its consciousness. Dörnyei (2005) mentions three distinguishing features of learning strategies: goal-directed,
intentionally invoked and effortful. Thus, why some students perform far better than others or why some students fail in language classroom has a direct relationship with learners' strategy use in language learning. It is an common observation that some learners are better than others, yet good learners do different things than poorer language learners (Gass and Selinker, 2008)

In foreign language learning and teaching, it is easily recognized both by teachers and learners that some students are more successful, use the received input in a linguistically productive way than others and do better in accomplishing the tasks given in classroom. Reid (1995) mentions that students' learning preferences are habitual and they prefer different ways while perceiving, processing, and retaining new information and skills. According to Oxford (2003), language learning styles and strategies students use account for their learning and the amount of the language they learn.

In addition to these opinions, Cohen (2003) and Oxford (1990) suggest that strategy use favors effectiveness in language learning. Also, according to Phakiti (2003), strategies either enhance learners' language learning and acquisition or enhance their performance in completing a language task, to communicate with others; whatever purpose they fulfill, strategy use is conscious on part of the learners. Thus, it is clear that if language learners have more awareness on their strategy use, they will be able to get insight into how to learn best; thus, they are likely to be more effective and skillful language learners. In fact, employing learning strategies enable learners to respond to the particular learning situations and to be able to take control of their own learning (Williams and Burden, 2000).

1.1. Classification of language learning strategies

Some researchers have different taxonomies about language learning strategies as meta-cognitive, cognitive, or socio-affective (Brown & Palinscar, 1982; Chamot, 1987, p.8; cited in Young, 2006). Another classification of Language Learning Strategies belongs to O'Malley and Chamot and their colleagues (1985, p.582). Their classification of LLS is based on the difference between metacognitive, cognitive and social-affective strategies. According to Robbins (2003), metacognitive strategies involve processes through which a learner plans for learning, monitoring his/her comprehension and production besides evaluating the targets in terms of whether they are achieved or not. Cognitive strategies are defined by Robbins (1993, p.594) as "cognitive strategies are those in which learner interacts with the material to be learned. This can be achieved by manipulating it mentally, as in making mental images or elaborating on previously acquired concepts or skills". Socio-affective strategies represent "interactions with others or 'ideational control' over affect" (Smith& Smith, 2006, p.100).

In addition to these taxonomies, Oxford's (1990, p.16-17) classifies the language learning strategies into two main categories as direct and indirect learning strategies, direct strategies refer to subconscious tasks, which are inherently learnt while indirect strategies refer to more conscious strategies. As a deep insight, Oxford (1990) also divides these two classifications into six sub-divisions; memory strategies, cognitive strategies and compensation
strategies under the heading of direct strategies, and metacognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies as indirect strategies.

1.2. Relationship between Language Learning Strategies and Success in Language Learning
Although much of the interest into language learning strategies came along with the studies conducted in the field of cognitive psychology, Williams and Burden (2000) emphasize that learning a language requires not only suitable cognitive skills but also some other skills as social and communicative skills because of the nature of language use-communicating with others. On the other hand, Oxford (1990) provides a number of contributions employing language learning strategies provide to language learning process and one of them is that language learning strategies foster the communicative competence. Additionally, in a study conducted by Chamot et al. (1987; cited in Ellis, 2008: 542) higher-level high school students of Russian and Spanish used more language learning strategies than the beginning-level students. In general, studies on learning strategies focused on the strategy type used by the learners and these were used in characterizing the behaviors of "good learners". Dörnyei (2005) conclude that what made learners more successful than others is the "students' own active and creative participation in the learning process through the application of individualized learning techniques" (p. 167). From the literature it is clear that students' language learning strategy use contribute to their language learning process.

In a study focusing on the vocabulary learning strategies of Turkish students, Çelik and Toptaş (2010) found out that learners' preferences for the vocabulary learning strategy use had a positive relation with their language levels. A recent study conducted by Dulger (2012) revealed the similar results with those of Çelik and Topbaş. In both studies Turkish EFL learners' strategy use seem to be associated with language proficiency. However, the strategies employed by the participants in these studies differ. According to Dulger (2012) cognitive strategies were utilized most however according to the study of Çelik and Topbaş (2010), cognitive strategies were the least used ones. In a another study, Sabuncuoğlu (2011) found out that most students preferred to make use of metacognitive strategies. What seems to be common in these studies is that social strategies are not preferred by the learners. Some other studies (Deneme, 2008; Arslan, Rata, Yavuz and Dragoescu, 2012; Ozmen & Gulleroglu, 2013) also give contrasting results on the types of strategies used; however, it can be explained that these differences may be the result of gender, experience with the language learning, age and level of proficiency.

1.3. Aim of the Study
Language learning has gained importance in Turkey over the last years and most universities offer compulsory English preparatory education for their students for a year. Gaining insight into learners' strategy use may help both learners and EFL teachers at university in providing a better language learning and teaching process. Thus, this study aims to determine the language learning strategies of three adult groups, who study at elementary,
pre-intermediate and intermediate level prep-classes at Pamukkale University.

1.4. Research Questions
1) What are the general language learning strategies used by university students enrolled in preparatory classes of English?
2) Do the strategies used differ according to;
   a) gender of the learners,
   b) age of the learners,
   c) level of the learners,
   d) type of high school learners attended

2. Methodology
This research study was primarily designed as a descriptive study and therefore adopts a quantitative approach. In line with the approach, survey methodology was used to obtain the opinions and self-perceptions of learners.

2.1. Settings and Participants
This research study was conducted with the participation of 185 Turkish EFL learners studying at preparatory classes who were selected randomly from different levels such as elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate levels for the research. In the research “the Strategies Inventory of Language Learning (Version 7.0)” developed by Rebecca Oxford was used because it is accepted as the most influential instrument in the area of language learning strategies to date (Rivera-Mills & Plonsky,2007). The questionnaire consisted of two parts: a) demographic information about the learners b) scale of language learning strategies consisting of 50 items which were translated into the learners’ native language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intermediate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated High Sch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science High School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Private School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolian High School</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General High School</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of age, gender, level and high school graduated
2.2. Instrument
In the study, to collect data, Oxford’s (1990) SILL “Strategy Inventory for Language Learning” (SILL) questionnaire which includes 6 sub-categories such as memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies was delivered to the participants. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Test of the Scale was applied to the data for adaptation purposes and reliability result was found as .92.

2.3. Data Analysis
The data gathered were analyzed by using SPSS.16. As in the scale used in Oxford R. (1990)’s Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, the strategy use levels which were between the “1.0 – 2.4” were considered as “low level of strategy use”, “2.5 – 3.5” were considered as “moderate level of strategy use”, and “3.5 – 5” were considered as “high level of strategy use”.

3. Findings
3.1. What are the general language learning strategies used by university students enrolled in preparatory classes of English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Strategy Use Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. General language learning strategies used by Turkish EFL Learners

As indicated in Table 1, in general, Turkish EFL Learners showed moderate (3.19) use of strategies. It is clear from the table that the highest strategy use among Turkish EFL Learners is meta-cognitive strategies (3.41), which is followed by compensation strategies (3.39) and cognitive strategies (3.21), besides social strategies (3.20), memory strategies (3.19), while the lowest strategy used by the participants is affective strategy (2.89). Although there are no significant differences in the use of metacognitive, cognitive, social and memory strategies, there is a significant difference among Turkish EFL Learners in the use of affective strategies.
3.2. **Do the strategies used differ according to:**

a) **gender of the learners,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sig. (2 tailed)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Gender of the participants

To answer the second research question, Independent Samples t-test was conducted to examine whether there is a significant difference between female and male participants. When female and male participants were compared, it was found out that there is no meaningful difference between the female and male participants. On the other hand, when it comes to the highest strategy used by the female participants is meta-cognitive, and the lowest one is affective. As regard to male participants, the most preferred strategy is compensation strategy, and the lowest one is affective, which is the same as female participants.

b) **age of the learners,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Age of the participants

Further, an analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the participants’ responses differ in terms of their ages. Table 3. demonstrates that the results regarding with the age and the strategies used signify that the highest strategies used by the participants between the ages 17-20 is compensation strategies, the lowest one is affective strategies, while the participants between the ages 21-25 states that the highest strategy is meta-cognitive and the lowest one is affective strategies.

c) **level of the learners,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.961</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.0559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intermediate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.204</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.0777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.1067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Level of the Turkish EFL Learners
Another aspect of the study was to find out the differences between the levels ranging from elementary to intermediate. Results in Table 4. indicate a slight difference in the use of strategies, and this difference comes from elementary level students and intermediate level students. The results showed that the lowest strategy use is in Elementary level students (2.96), Pre-intermediate level students have a moderate level of strategy use (3.20), and the highest level strategy use is in Intermediate level participants which is (3.46). It can be concluded that as the proficiency level of the EFL learners rises, the strategy use rises, as well.

Table 5. One Way Anova Results According to Language Levels of Turkish Students

According to Table 5, as the significance level of the analysis is higher than 0.05 (p=0.405), it can be concluded that there is no statistically meaningful difference in learners' strategy use in terms of their language level although mean scores indicate a slight increase in their strategy use from elementary to intermediate level students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science High School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Private School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolian High School</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General High School</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Type of high school the participants graduated

Another comparison was done related to the high school graduated. When various high schools the participants graduated were examined, although there is no meaningful difference in strategy use between College/private school, Anatolian High School, General High School and others, it can be easily stated that the participants who graduated from Science High School
are the ones who prefer the strategy use at minimum level. The participants who graduated from Science High School tend to have the lowest mean scores because during their education at high school, they just focus on the University Entrance Exam more, and they spend less time on foreign language learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>0,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57,783</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0,326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61,489</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. One Way Anova Results According Type of high school the participants graduated

Again to compare the learners' strategy use in language learning, Anova analysis of the groups based on their high school indicates no significance since Anova score is higher than 0,05 (p=0,191).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In an efficient teaching system, the learners have to be an efficient part of the learning environment. There are different ways in learning, and being aware of these ways has a crucial role for learning actively. One of the basic responsibilities of the teachers should be teaching the students the strategies the learners may use during the learning process. As discussed in literature review, language learning strategies are highly important in learning a language (Arslan, Rata, Yavuz and Dragoescu, 2012). Although the students expose to a variety of language learning strategies, metacognitive strategies are the most preferred one, on the other hand, affective strategies are preferred at a minimum level. The high preference for metacognitive strategies means that the learners are able to manage their own learning. In addition, as metacognitive strategies allow learners to plan their learning, these strategies support classroom language learning (Arslan, Rata, Yavuz and Dragoescu, 2012).

The data gathered from Turkish EFL learners are compatible with the previous research findings carried out in Turkey (Arslan, Rata, Yavuz and Dragoescu, 2012) on the use of language learning strategies. Results shows that memory and metacognitive strategies are the most preferred ones by Turkish EFL learners, and affective and cognitive strategies are used the least. Razı's (2012) study states that while compensation and metacognitive strategies are mostly preferred by Turkish participants, affective and social strategies are preferred the least.

When the findings considered together, the research shows that Turkish EFL adult learners studying in prep classes have moderate level of strategy use. How to use the language learning strategies and the types of language learning strategies must be taught to the learners and the learning atmosphere should be designed for the learners to use different language
learning strategies. For the learners to use the language learning strategies in an efficient way, the teachers should be informed about what the learning strategies are, how to be used and in what situation (Senemoğlu, 2004). However, the research clearly showed that affective strategy is the strategy which is used the least by the Turkish EFL adult learners. Strategies can be developed, and when the teachers have enough information and experience about the learner strategies, it will certainly help the learners to improve more in language learning.

As a further research, the studies which aim to find out the reasons why Turkish EFL learners use the affective strategies least would be beneficial and try to put out a training program to enhance this strategy to facilitate the learning atmosphere.
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Abstract

This study aims to investigate the type and frequency of language learning strategy used by students learning English as a foreign language and to determine the effects of proficiency level and gender on strategy use by Turkish University Preparatory English students at tertiary level in Turkey. The SILL was used to measure the independent variable of language learning strategies. It is aimed to find the strategies the students utilize and to find out the links between their strategy use and success in English using the Turkish translation of Oxford’s fifty-nine item Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL Version 7.0) investigated the self-reported language learning strategy use. Results of the questionnaire were analyzed by using the SPSS to find the relationship between learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social) of the students according to their nationality, age, course level, academic achievement or gender in English. To reveal the correlation between these factors, Spearman’s correlation coefficient was performed on the gathered data. The results showed that females used the same language learning strategies respectively at the same frequency with the males while learning English. It was found out that although language learning strategies may have some effect on language learning performance, there are certainly other factors which affect students’ choice of language learning strategies and language performance. Furthermore, the statistical analyses carried out with respect to the participants’ mean and standard deviation scores of frequency of strategy use revealed that in the five categories cognitive, affective, metacognitive, memory, social - and some SILL items. Standard data collection procedures, such as the SILL, which measure the LLSs with respect to some language product only in quantitative terms, and which disregard the socio-cultural or personal elements of the foreign language learning process, may not be sufficient to yield reliable results.

Keywords EFL, Language Learning strategies, Strategies Inventory in Language Learning, Second Language Learning

1. Introduction

The strategies a student uses to learn a second language depend outstandingly on their individual learning styles. Some students are outgoing and will experiment freely and frequently while learning a new language whilst other students are more introverted, preferring a more individual, private approach to the way they learn and practice the language. Cognitive strategies let the students cover the language material in direct ways, e.g., through synthesizing, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, reasoning, outlining, reorganizing information to develop stronger schemas.
(knowledge structures), practicing unnaturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally. On the other hand; metacognitive strategies (e.g., defining one’s own learning style preferences and needs analysis, planning for an L2 task, accumulating and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, observing mistakes, and evaluating task success, and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy) are employed for managing the learning process overall.

The factors which effect learning can be age, motivation, culture, individual learning style or language learning strategies of the participants. A foreign language teacher must use different strategies as they are teaching grammar, spelling, reading, writing, vocabulary or listening. as learners apply different language learning strategies in the process of second language learning. Among these factors, learning strategies are defined as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques --such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task -- used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992, p. 63).

In the process of learning a second language, it is better for learners to be aware of the ways they learn most effectively. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) defined learning strategies (LS) broadly as "behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning" which are "intended to influence the learner’s encoding process" (p. 315). Nunan (1999: 171) explains that strategies are the mental and communicative procedures learners use in order to learn and use a language. “Learning style is the biologically and developmentally imposed set of characteristics that make the same teaching method wonderful for some and terrible for others” (Dunn & Griggs, 1988, p. 3).

As the teachers are responsible for the students’ learning in second language classrooms, they are required to be able to teach language in an effective way and to identify students’ needs to increase their awareness in language learning since, “... learning a second language is a complex process” (Brown 1980: 1). The more that teachers know about their students’ style preferences, the more effectively they can direct their L2 instruction. Learning styles and strategies help teachers determine a particular learner’s ability and eagerness to work within the framework of various instructional methodologies. Wenden (1985, p.7) stated that teachers should become —attuned to their students’ learning strategies and they need to be sensitive to how their students approach language learning and to the beliefs they have about it. Explicit instruction in strategies can make students use the learned strategy more frequently and more effectively, help them become better language learners, help them add strategies to their repertoire of learning tools, and encourage them to decide which strategies are most effective for particular tasks (Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary & Robbins, 1999). That is why, teachers need to encourage students to use the strategies that are positively connected to achievement by designing classroom activities or tasks to reinforce them or by obtaining strategy instruction in order to make sure that students make use of these strategies to the utmost extent the introduction part, the study should be introduced, literature should be reviewed and discussed on the narrow.
1.1. Literature review

Learning strategies are intentionally used and consciously controlled by the learner (Pressley with McCormick, 1995). Learning strategies are defined as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques -- such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task -- used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992, p. 63). Oxford (1990a), for example, seems to describe many of my Turkish EFL students when she writes:

...many language students (even adults)...like to be told what to do, and they only do what is clearly essential to get a good grade -- even if they fail to develop useful skills in the process. Attitudes and behaviours like these make learning more difficult and must be changed, or else any effort to train learners to rely more on themselves and use better strategies is bound to fail. (Oxford, 1990a, p. 10).

The phrase ‘learning style’ refers to a person’s general approach to learning and is dependent upon that person’s cognitive, affective and behavioral characteristics (Oxford, “The Role of Styles and Strategies in Second Language Learning”, 1989). Basically, the phrase ‘learning strategies’ refers to the actions and behaviours a person uses to learn (Oxford, 1989.) All learners use strategies to help them succeed, but not all are aware of the strategies they use. As Rebecca Oxford states: “...the most successful learners tend to use learning strategies that are appropriate to the material, to the task, and to their own goals, needs, and stage of learning,” (Oxford, 1989). So as to the question: What types of learning strategies do students use?

According to Naiman, Frohlich, and Todesco (1975) successful second language learners use the following six strategies:

1. select language situations that allow one's (learning) preferences to be used
2. actively involve themselves in language learning
3. see language as both a rule system and a communication tool
4. extend and revise one's understanding of the language
5. learn to think in the language
6. address the affective demands of language learning

Oxford (1989) identifies six broad categories of strategies:

1. metacognitive (e.g. self-monitoring, paying attention)
2. affective (e.g. self-encouragement, anxiety reduction)
3. social (e.g. ask questions, become culturally aware)
4. memory (e.g. grouping, imagery, associating)
5. cognitive (e.g. reasoning, analyzing, summarizing)
6. compensation (e.g. guessing meanings, using synonyms)

The teacher is expected to bring these strategies to the attention of learners regardless of the subject matter. This includes encouraging students who
already exhibit use of these strategies so that others might 'notice' and imitate them. Brown (2001: 208-221) states that language teachers are to equip their students with a sense of what successful language learners do to achieve success and to aid them in developing their own unique, individual pathways to success in the classroom.

As long as our teaching is appropriate and learner-centered, we will not need to manipulate our students as we urge them to develop and use their own LLS. Instead we will take learners' motivations, needs and learning styles into account as we English teachers in order for them to improve their L2/FL skills and LLS.

Their strategies differ greatly, at least in part because their general learning styles (overall approaches to learning and the environment) are so varied. Recent research (Ehrman & Oxford, 1988, 1989; Oxford & Ehrman, 1988) suggests that learning style has a significant influence on students' choice of learning strategies, and that both styles and strategies affect learning outcomes. The essential transfer of a strategy from one language or language skill to another is a unavoidable goal of LLS, as Pearson (1988) and Skehan (1989) have discussed. In her teacher-oriented text, Oxford summarizes her view of LLS by listing twelve key features. In addition to the characteristics noted above, she states that LLS:

1. They contribute to the main goal, communicative competence.
2. They allow learners to become more self-directed.
3. They expand the role of teachers.
4. They are problem-oriented.
5. They are specific actions taken by the learner.
6. They involve many aspects of the learner, not only the cognitive.
7. They support learning both directly and indirectly.
8. They are not always observable.
9. They are often conscious.
10. They can be taught.
11. They are flexible.
12. They are influenced by a variety of factors. (Oxford, 1990a, p. 9)

The term learning style is used to encompass four aspects of the person: cognitive style, i.e., preferred or habitual patterns of mental functioning; patterns of attitudes and interests that affect what an individual will pay most attention to in a learning situation; a tendency to seek situations compatible with one's own learning patterns; and a tendency to use certain learning strategies and avoid others (Lawrence, 1984). Richards and Platt (1992 cited in Saltuk 2001: 12) define language learning strategies as “intentional behaviour and thoughts used by learners during learning so as to better help them understand, learn or remember new information”.

Learning style is inherent and pervasive (Willing, 1988) and is a blend of cognitive, affective, and behavioral elements (Oxford & Ehrman, 1988). It is vital for teachers to study their teaching context, learning strategies, methodological considerations paying special attention to their students, their materials, and their own way of teaching. If we are going to train our
students in using LLS, it is crucial to know something about these individuals, their needs, interests, motivations, learning styles, etc. Research results on language learning strategies show that effective learners change their strategies according to the task and their personal needs. Therefore, by using strategies in language learning, learners become more independent in the process of learning as they can evaluate their own learning (Saltuk 2001: 14).

Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014a) emphasizes that a fifth language skill can be conveyed as culture beside listening, speaking, reading and writing. What the would-be fifth language skill equips us with is the formation of mindset and techniques to adapt our use of English to learn about, comprehend and appreciate the values, manners of doing things and special qualities of other cultures. It means understanding how to use language to accept difference, to be more flexible and tolerant of ways of doing things which can turn out to be different than ours. It is an attitudinal change that is expressed through the use of language.

Like other Turkish students, the ones in Zirve University School of Foreign Languages have difficulty in producing the language via writing. Many instructors have tried diverse approaches and methods to help them produce better writings whereas few of these have succeeded. Also, every year writing books in each level were undergone a change. With every change it is possible to say that some students find some of these books useful while others think they are totally ineffective. The only result of this may be that books do not appeal all of the students in a class. Some of the students' attention and interest can be high in one activity of pair work, but the others are deaf to this kind of activity. “Factors such as physical layout, design, structure and length will be a key concern both for motivation and for classroom effectiveness” (Jolly & Bolitho, 1998, p. 282). In order to understand the students and produce the appropriate materials for their needs is very essential in writing classes. In the contrary case, students may have a chance to learn everything in the classroom, but they will fail to produce the language outside the classroom because they are unable to use their productive skills as expected from a language learner. Thus, this study stems from this failure of students in Zirve University in producing and writing something in English.

Strategies that fulfill these conditions “make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations” (Oxford, Learning Styles & Strategies/Oxford 1990, p. 8). Learning strategies can also enable students to become more independent, autonomous, lifelong learners (Allwright, 1990; Little, 1991). As strategy instruction is very important as teachers may not be able to teach all the language skills that students will need in the future, language teachers may explicitly discuss how a strategy works, when it might be used and why they need it by offering examples of how they have used strategies for similar language tasks.
1.2. Research Questions
1. Is there any significant difference in using language learning strategies of the participants according to their nationality, age, level, academic achievement or gender?
2. What are the language learning strategies of a Prep class students at a university in Turkey?

1.3. Hypotheses

1) There are no statistically significant differences in average results on SILL subscales between males and females.
2) SILL subscales are in statistically significant correlations with each other.
3) English level is correlated statistically significant with results on SILL subscales.
4) Age of the participants is not in statistically significant correlations with results on SILL subscales.

2. Methodology
2.1. Participants
A total of 149 students participated in our research. Mean age of our respondents was $M = 20.74$ and standard deviation $SD = 2.135$. The age ranged from 17 to 26 years.
Gender distribution of our sample is displayed in Figure 1.

From Figure 1, we can see that there were more females ($n = 81$, or 54.4%) than males ($n = 68$, i.e. 45.6%) in our sample.

Next graph (Figure 2) shows the number of students for each of the three following English levels (A, B and C).
As we can see in Figure 2, there are 54 students at A – level of English (i.e. 36.2% of the total sample), 60 students at B – level (40.3%) and 35 of them at C – level (23.5%).

2.2. Instruments
We applied Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, Oxford, 1989), which is composed of six subscales (named part A, B, C, D, E, & F). Part A refers to remembering more effectively, part B to using all one’s mental processes, part C covers compensating for missing knowledge, part D covers organizing and evaluating one’s learning, part E refers to managing one’s emotions and part F refers to learning with others.

More broadly, the first part of the inventory included questions about personal information of the participant such as his age, gender and name. Other social, cultural and educational background issues were not taken into consideration due to the limitations of the study. The second part of the inventory consisted of questions about the language learning strategies which the participants employed in the process of English language learning. The original language learning strategy inventory for foreigners (The Strategy Inventory for foreigners) and the original version (for Jordanian participants) and the translated version (for Turkish participants) of the inventory comprised 50 questions including direct and indirect strategies (see Appendix 1) in which questions 1 to 9 were related to ‘memory strategies’; 30 questions 10 to 23 referred to the ‘cognitive strategies’, questions 24 to 29 were related to ‘compensation strategies’; questions 30 to 38 belonged to ‘metacognitive strategies’, questions 39 to 44 pertained to ‘affective strategies’ and questions 45 to 50 concerned ‘social strategies’ in learning.

We calculated Cronbach alpha coefficients to test internal reliability of these six subscales. Their values are high enough for (in the brackets are the coefficients and numbers of items for each subscale): part F (α = .960, n = 6), part D (α = .747, n = 9) and part E (α = .625, n = 6).

On the other side, they are poor for the following subscales: part B (α = .626, n = 14), part A (α = .518, n = 9) and part C (α = .217, n = 6).

The researcher firstly read the questions to the participants in order to avoid any misunderstanding of any question mentioned in the inventory and then gave them a period of time to read and answer the each question.
3. Results and Discussion

First, we calculated average results for every SILL subscale. We did it because there were different numbers of items from subscales to subscales. The results are displayed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale (part)</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Descriptive statistical values for SILL subscales

Legend: Min – minimal value; Max – maximal value; M – arithmetic mean; SD – standard deviation.

From Table 1, we can see that participants use strategy for remembering more effectively (part A) the most (M = 4.41). The least used learning strategy is managing their own emotions (part E), where average result is M = 3.76. The most dispersed results are those for the part F (learning with others), where SD = 0.97. The least dispersed results are those on subscale A (remembering more effectively), what we concluded from the value of their standard deviation (SD = 0.31).

In order to determine if there are gender differences in the average results on SILL subscales, we have applied t-test for independent samples. The results are shown in Table 2.

As we can see (Table 2), there are no statistically significant differences in any of the SILL subscales: part A (t(147) = 0.352, p > .05), part B (t(147) = -0.192, p > .05), part C (t(147) = 1.550, part D (t(147) = 0.469, p > .05), part E (t(147) = -0.679, p > .05), & part F (t(147) = -1.860, p > .05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale (part)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>ΔM</th>
<th>SEΔM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.679</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-1.860</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Gender differences in scores on SILL subscales
However, in Table 2, we can also see that in the case of subscale F (learning with others), the p-value is very close to the critical value of p = .05 (our p is .065). Therefore, we can suppose that other researchers could get statistically significant results for this subscale, i.e. females (M = 4.19) learn with others more frequently than males (M = 3.90).

In our case, we have proved the first hypothesis, that is, there are no statistically significant gender differences in using and applying learning strategies.

In order to test our second hypothesis i.e. there are statistically significant correlations between different language learning strategies, we used Pearson’s coefficient of correlation. The results are shown in Table 3.

From the first sight at Table 3, we can conclude that there are more statistically significant coefficients, than non-significant. Part A (remembering more effectively) is in statistically significant positive correlations with all other parts (sub-scales) of SILL: part B (using all mental processes; r = .456, p < .001), part C (compensating for missing knowledge; r = .284, p < .001); part D (organizing and evaluating one’s learning; r = .351, p < .001); part E (managing one’s own emotions; r = .273, p < .01), & part E (learning with others; r = .243, p < .01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.456***</td>
<td>.284***</td>
<td>.351***</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.456***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.284***</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.351***</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.762***</td>
<td>.717***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.762***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.887***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.717***</td>
<td>.887***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Matrix of intercorrelations for SILL subscales

* correlation coefficient is significant at level .05,
** correlation coefficient is significant at level .01,
*** correlation coefficient is significant at level .001.

Part B is correlated with part C and this coefficient is small, but statistically significant (r = .196, p < .05). Subscale/part D (organizing and evaluating one’s own learning) is in a high positive and statistically significant correlation with part E (r = .762, p < .001) and part F (r = .717, p < .001). Part E (managing one’s own emotions) is also in a high positive and statistically significant correlation with part F (r = .887, p < .001). Hence, organizing and evaluating learning, managing emotions during learning process and learning with others are strongly connected activities one with each other. Therefore, we have proved the most part of our second hypothesis.
To test our third hypothesis, i.e. English level is positively correlated with using different language learning strategies, we calculated Spearman’s rho coefficients $r_s$ (we did so, because "English level" is ordinal variable). The results are displayed in Table 4.

In Table 4, we can conclude that we must reject our hypothesis, because there are no statistically significant results. All correlation coefficients are small and non-significant. The highest is the correlation between English level and part C (compensating for missing knowledge; $r_s = -0.067, p > 0.05$) and the lowest is between English level and part B (using all one's mental processes; $r_s = -0.015, p > 0.05$). Table 5 shows Pearson’s correlation coefficients between age and strategies which are measured through subscales of SILL.

### Table 4. Correlations between English level and SILL subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data in Table 5, we have proved our fourth hypothesis, because there are no statistically significant coefficients in it. As in Table 4, there are small and non-significant. The highest correlation coefficient is between age of our respondents and results in part A (remembering more effectively; $r = 0.081, p > 0.05$) and the lowest is between participants’ age and results in part B (using all one's mental processes; $r = -0.021, p > 0.05$).

### Table 5. Correlations between age of participants and SILL subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Pearson's r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Conclusion

The following results have been inferred from our empirical research.

1) There are no gender differences in using six language learning strategies from SILL.
2) Most of different learning strategies are connected one to each other and some of them are highly correlated with each other.
3) Correlations between results on SILL subscales and English level of participants (A, B and C) are not statistically significant. Hence,
English level is not associated with applying learning strategies which we have examined.

4) Correlation coefficients between results on six parts of SILL and participants’ age are not statistically significant, i.e. age is not connected with using these learning strategies.

To shed a light on the above-mentioned correlation findings, this is an empirical study based on a survey research. The study attempted to investigate the use of the language learning strategies of 150 participants at the university Prep class level according to their nationality, age, level, academic achievement and gender aiming to integrate language learning strategy training into language instruction to enhance students‘ language learning and the effect of strategy instruction on language learning. It is aimed to determine the relationship between dependent and independent variables. According to Hatch and Farhady (1982: 15), ‘Independent Variable’ is explained as a major variable which the researcher hopes to investigate; it is the variable which is selected, manipulated and measured by the researcher, while ‘Dependent Variable’ is defined as a variable which the researcher observes and measures to determine the effect of the independent variable. In our research, English level variable is correlated statistically significant with results on SILL subscales and the age variable of the participants are not in statistically significant correlations with the results on SILL subscales.

Preparatory school students use metacognitive strategies more than cognitive strategies. The learning style preferences of the Turkish university prep students are introvert, auditory, random-intuitive, synthesizing, deductive and reflective learning styles while females tend to prefer visual learning style, males are more auditory. The results offered that the LLS most commonly used by the young adult Turkish preparation class students of EFL in state universities are compensation strategies and then metacognitive strategies most often, followed by cognitive, memory social and affective strategies. Whereas auditory learning styles correlate with memory and cognitive strategies; individual learning style correlates with compensation strategies. The findings of our study revealed that use of LLS are positively effective in success in English, that females were respectively a little more successful than males in terms of achievement tests, and that they used more or less the same language learning strategies in learning English. It was also found that learners from different proficiency levels used strategies with very similar frequency.

Depending on the statistical results, it is found out that there is a significant connection between gender, language learning strategies in English but no difference between the participants’ memory strategies according to their nationality, age, academic achievement and gender. Nevertheless, gender differences in language learning strategies do not necessarily mean that people of one gender are progressing better at language learning than people of the other as suggested by Green and Oxford (1995). Using LLS and LLS training in the L2/FL class not only urges learners in their language learning but also helps teachers reflect on and improve their teaching. When language learners are well aware of their talents or if they know how to learn...
a foreign language effectively, they will necessarily change their strategies according to the task or to their needs. Taking the students’ level and prior knowledge and their targets in learning the language into consideration, foreign language teachers should give equal weight to all four skills, accuracy and fluency. It is a strongly recommended strategy that students both enjoy and from which they learn; therefore, encouraging students to use these foreign language learning strategies will help their motivation and establish a positive attitude towards learning English.

Aydoğan & Akbarov point out that (2014a) the globalization of English language and an increasing demand for challenging English skills has placed a substantive emphasis on English language teaching in Turkey. Most students in Turkey reach the tertiary level with an educational infrastructure in which ‘classroom activities are characterized by the instructors covering the syllabus that students ingest, not leaving much space for questioning and criticism consciously which gives rise to students’ blaming the educational system for all. The students do not hold a chance of interacting in EFL context because of the known inhibiting factors and they feel reluctant and shy to internalize and see it as a way of life (Aydoğan & Akbarov, 2014b).

Consequently, language learners can evaluate their learning process and can become more active and effective learners grasping easily and quickly if they know how to use language learning strategies. Although language learning strategies have been believed to have a fundamental place in second language acquisition since they became well known in the 1980s and 1990s, they have disappointed classroom teachers due to their vague nature (Gu, 2010, cited in Oxford, 2011). Thus; for a more comprehensive and elaborate research, the other learner based factors such as anxiety, motivation, attitude, learners’ beliefs about language learning, learning styles, family background and support etc. can be worked on in future studies as it would not be judicious to put the language learning success of students down to the fact of only one factor, i.e. strategies. Green and Oxford (1995, p. 292) emphasize the importance of the factors which affect students’ choice of LLS and language performance by stating that “the more that teachers know about such factors, the more readily the teacher can come to grips with the nature of individual differences in the classroom. Such knowledge is power—the power to plan lessons so that students with many different characteristics, including varied strategies, can receive what they need.”
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1. Introduction

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

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

The essay is divided into five sections. The first three discuss definitions of language attitude, choice, and shift, respectively. These sections discuss the authors more or less alphabetically, within the context of specific considerations of each topic, offering condensed discussions or definitions from their texts about language attitude, choice and shift. At the
end of each section, I provide a brief summary of the main similarities and differences among the various discussions. The fourth section provides a critical overview of the literature available on language attitude surveys. In this section, I briefly discuss various pertinent readings, outlining the principal methods and findings of the authors and critiquing them according to their usefulness and importance. The last section deals with the surveys themselves. This is the section where my own sample surveys can be found. These are designed to be applicable to participants from various social strata and educational backgrounds.

**Definitions of Language Attitude**

Researchers follow a wide range of perspectives on how to theorize, investigate, or otherwise talk about language attitudes, although few offer outright definitions. Those who do address definitions of attitudes in general and language attitudes in particular include Crystal (1997), Davies (1995), and Jaspaert and Kroon (1988).

Jaspaert and Kroon (1988) offer a basic definition of attitude in general: “the common core of definitions of the attitude concept [is] the interpretation of attitude as a mental construct offering an explanation for consistency in behaviour” (p. 158). Crystal (1997) and Davies (1995) are more specific, offering perhaps the most succinct definitions of what a language attitude is: “The feelings people have about their own language or the languages of others” (Crystal, 1997, p. 215); “language attitudes ... form part of the communicative competence of the members of the speech community” (Davies, 1995, p. 23).

Davies (1995) goes on to elaborate on the significance of language attitudes, which are “generally assumed to contribute towards an explanation of patterns of linguistic variation, for example, linguistic attitudes and stereotypes can be a powerful force in influencing linguistic behaviour and, ultimately, linguistic forms themselves [Trudgill, Labov and Fasold 1979, p. viii-ix]” (p. 23). Jaspaert and Kroon (1988), for their part, explicitly link attitudes with language shift and language choice, discussing possible social theories to explain certain contradictory outcomes:

[S]ocial factors have an ambiguous influence on language shift processes: in some instances a factor seems to influence language shift in one direction, whereas in another situation that same factor exerts an influence in the opposite direction (Fishman 1972a). As Fishman (1972a) points out, this ambivalence can only be lifted by introducing a theory of social influence on language shift which accounts for the occurrence and the direction of patterns of influence on language shift in relation to the social and linguistic situation in which the process is studied ... In such a theory, attitudes, or concepts related to attitudes, may occupy a prominent place. It should be noted, however, that in most cases attitudes are introduced in linguistic research as fairly isolated concepts, not clearly related to any theory for the explanation of behavior (p. 157).
Edwards (1994) goes into greater detail in explaining attitudes in general and how they work: “attitude is a disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects.” It is generally thought to be composed of three elements: “feelings (affective element), thoughts (cognitive element) and, following upon these, predispositions to act in a certain way (behavioural element). That is, one knows or believes something, has some emotional reaction to it and, therefore, may be assumed to act on this basis” (pp. 97-98). However, he also points out that there is always the possibility of inconsistency between expressed attitudes and the actions that apparently result from them. Furthermore, attitudes are often confused with beliefs, particularly when dealing with languages. This confusion most likely arises because belief is an element of the “thought” (cognitive) component of attitude, and it is often clearly exposed on questionnaires designed to elucidate attitudes and beliefs. For example, “a mother’s response to the query, ‘Is knowledge of French important for your children, yes or no?’ indicates a belief. To gauge attitude one would require further probing into the respondent’s feeling about her expressed belief: for example, she might believe that French is important for her children’s career success; yet, she may loathe the language. Thus, many ‘attitude’ questionnaires are, in fact, ‘belief’ questionnaires” (pp. 97-98).

Finally, Edwards also comments on the influence attitude can have on language policy, noting that “It is not surprising that most linguistic preferences – based upon historical pedigree, aesthetic judgement, ‘logic’ or whatever – reveal a liking for one’s own variety.” In fact, such “attitudes, prejudices and preferences about language and language choice” are often carried to the logical extreme of codifying them in laws or sanctioning them in practice, through the efforts of the socially dominant. … Many of the difficulties encountered by minority-language communities in particular emerge because local desires do not mesh with state policy” (pp. 6-7).

Massey (1986) prefers Kahn and Weiss’s (1973) perspective of attitude, which recognizes that despite the broad range of definitions of attitudes, they all share some aspects in common: “attitudes are selectively acquired and integrated through learning and experience; they are enduring dispositions indicating response consistency; and positive or negative affect toward a social or psychological object represents the salient characteristic of an attitude (p. 761)” (p. 608).

Omdal (1995) offers his take on attitudes in general, and language attitudes more specifically, noting that although it is a widely used concept, there is little agreement on a definition, even in social psychology. He cites the same three categories of attitude listed by other researchers—cognitive, evaluative, and conative (or reactional):

[B]efore a person can react consistently to an object, he or she must know something about it and is then able to evaluate the object positively or negatively; this knowledge and these feelings are usually accompanied by behavioral intentions. Within the definition of language attitudes, it is also quite common to include attitudes towards language users, and not only attitudes toward language and
language use ... Furthermore, one has to consider both 'overt' and 'covert' language attitudes (p. 86).

Richards et al. (1992) define language attitude simply as "The attitudes which speakers of different languages or language varieties have towards each other's languages or to their own language." They continue on to explain that positive or negative attitudes could be based on considerations as straightforward as “linguistic difficulty or simplicity, ease or difficulty of learning, degree of importance, elegance, social status, etc.,” although they could also reflect attitudes towards the speakers of a language. They also point out that language attitudes can influence learning a second or foreign language, and conclude with, “The measurement of language attitudes provides information which is useful in language teaching and language planning" (p. 199).

Finally, Schiffman (1996) offers a more widely-encompassing definition of language attitude, which he refers to as linguistic culture, and which is pertinent for language contact situations involving all aspects of language maintenance or shift:

linguistic culture [is] the set of behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language. That is, the beliefs (one might even use the term myths) that a speech community has about language (and this includes literacy) in general and its language in particular (from which it usually derives its attitudes towards other languages) are part of the social conditions that affect the maintenance and transmission of its language (p. 5).

A number of researchers discuss the distinction between behaviourist versus mentalist approaches to studying attitudes. The behaviourist view holds that “attitudes must be studied by observing the responses to certain languages, i.e. their use in actual interactions. The mentalist view considers attitudes as an internal, mental state, which may give rise to certain forms of behaviour” (Appel & Muysken, 1987, p. 16; emphasis in original).

Fasold (1987) is of the opinion that the majority of language attitude studies take the mentalist view “of attitude as a state of readiness; an intervening variable between a stimulus affecting a person and that person’s response.” That is, one’s attitude towards something sets up a propensity to “react to a given stimulus in one way rather than in another. A typical mentalist definition of attitude is given by Williams (1974: 21): ‘Attitude is considered as an internal state aroused by stimulation of some type and which may mediate the organism’s subsequent response’.” Fasold suggests that this view of attitude can be problematic from a research perspective because if it is something internal, and not externally observable, then “we must depend on the person’s reports of what their attitudes are, or infer attitudes indirectly from behavior patterns” (pp. 147-148).

On the other hand, the behaviorist view holds that “attitudes are to be found simply in the responses people make to social situations.” Such a
perspective, while it simplifies research, since such personal responses would be directly observable, and not subject to “self-reports or indirect inferences ... would not be quite as interesting, because they cannot be used to predict other behavior.” Further differentiating the behaviorist from the mentalist definition is the perception of an attitude as a single unit in the behaviorist definition, while mentalists tend to break attitudes down into subparts, such as cognitive (knowledge), affective (feeling), and conative (action) components” (pp. 147-148).

A final point that Fasold (1987) makes is to differentiate degrees of language attitude studies:

Some language-attitude studies are strictly limited to attitudes towards language itself. ... Most often, however, the definition of language attitude is broadened to include attitudes towards speakers of a particular language or dialect. An even further broadening of the definition allows all sorts of behavior concerning language to be treated, including attitudes toward language maintenance and planning efforts (pp. 147-148).

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

Münstermann and van Hout (1988) also note the relationship between attitude and behavior, and seem to focus on the mentalist perspective towards attitude. They reference work as early as 1935 that takes this point of view, so it is by no means a novel approach:

The older social-psychological definitions of the concept of attitude suggest, often explicitly, a fairly direct relationship between attitude and behaviour ... [e.g., Allport 1935:] 'a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a direct or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.' This definition implies that an attitude is a hypothetical, latent construct which has explanatory value for differences in reaction of individuals and groups towards the same object or situation. Differences in reaction go back to differences in attitude, whereas differences in attitudes are brought about by differences in experiences or information regarding an object or situation. Arguing along these lines one can see three components emerge: a cognitive (information) component, an evaluative or affective component and a conative or behavioural component, and between
these three components a strong connection is assumed to exist. However, it is precisely these relationships between the components which are continuously disputed in social psychology. ... The conclusion must be that attitudes should be studied in relationship with other predictors of behaviour and with processes intermediating between attitude and behaviour and not in isolation (pp. 174-175).

Baker (1996), for his part, goes in a different direction, outlining Williams’s (1991) typology of attitudes towards the language environment and its possible influence on “the survival and spread of minority languages.” “First, the evolutionist [attitude] will tend to follow Darwin’s idea of the survival of the fittest. Those languages that are strong will survive. The weaker languages will either have to adapt themselves to their environment, or die.” Of course, this view is overly simplistic, not to mention negative; besides not taking into account the myriad mediating factors that could influence “fitness,” its principal focus is on the negative end of the survival scale: language death, exploitation and suppression. A more positive view is interdependence rather than constant competition. Cooperation for mutually beneficial outcomes can be as possible as exploitation.” In addition to an evolutionary perspective, we can also talk about a conservationist one, in which minority languages must be protected and preserved somehow, because they are important for “the maintenance of variety in the language garden.” Finally, there are preservationists, who are more conservative and traditional than conservationists. Not only do they want to maintain and preserve minority languages, but they want to maintain the status quo as well. They are not interested in developing the language: “Preservationists are concerned that any change, not just language change, will damage the chances of survival of their language. ... Whereas conservationists may think global and act local, preservationists will tend to think local and act local” (pp. 41-42).

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

Ferguson (1996) is concerned with the effect of attitudes on language policy, particularly as applied to education. He notes that attitudes can play a greater role in the effectiveness of such educational policies than “the simple demographic facts of language distribution and use.” However, this fact is not the end of the story. Since such attitudes are so important to educational policy outcomes, it is, of course, important to understand those attitudes. For instance, “What do the speakers of a language believe or feel about its esthetic, religious, and 'logical' values? About the appropriateness of its use for literature, education, and 'national' purposes? ... What do the speakers of a language believe or feel about other languages in the country?
Are they better or inferior to their own language in general or for specific purposes?” These are some common questions that might appear in one way or another on a language attitude survey. However, elucidating language attitudes is often more difficult than simply obtaining answers to such questions, and may, in addition, “raise political issues which threaten the successful carrying out of a language survey” (pp. 274-275).

Knops & van Hout (1988) observe the general relationship between language attitudes and language maintenance or shift, before going into more detail by citing Cooper and Fishman’s (1974) two classifications of language attitudes, and offer a critique of them:

[Language attitude is] relevant to the definition of speech communities, to the explanation of linguistic change, language maintenance and language shift, and to applied concerns in the fields of intergroup communication, language planning and education. ... According to Cooper and Fishman (1974), two approaches to the definition of language attitudes are available. The first approach consists of defining the concept in terms of its referent, thereby stressing the independency of the concept as a phenomenon in its own right. In this approach language attitudes are attitudes towards languages, language varieties, language variants and language behaviour. The second approach is to define language attitudes in terms of their effects or consequences, i.e., those attitudes which influence language behaviour and behaviour towards language. The main argument in favour of this second approach is that any attitude influencing language behaviour or behaviour towards language is worthwhile to study in sociolinguistics. The problem however is that this definition seems too broad, since almost any attitude under the right conditions might affect language behaviour or behaviour towards language. ... With the first definition, the latter distinction is possible, but this definition has the disadvantage of being too narrow; it excludes attitudes of interest to sociolinguists, e.g., attitudes towards organized efforts involved in language planning, attitudes towards the functions allocated to language, and—most importantly—attitudes towards the speakers of a language. Therefore a broad definition of language attitudes is usually adopted, and only when necessary, the distinction between this broad category of attitudes and language attitudes in the strict or narrow sense of the word is made (pp. 1-2).

They later discuss possible causes of differences in language attitudes. These could include stimulus effects, or those linguistic factors that may influence language attitudes; subject effects, which are “social characteristics of the immediate situation or to characteristics of the broader socio-cultural environment in which language attitudes develop”; or situational effects, which take into account factors that might cause changes in language attitudes (p. 9).

Romaine (1995) gives many details which are pertinent to understanding and researching attitudes. The closest she comes to a definition is the following, which is more nearly related to attitude assessment than attitude per se:
Attitude is a more general concept than can be accurately determined from the answer to a specific question or from the responses given by an informant in a carefully controlled experimental situation. The translation of the notion of “attitude” from the subjective domain into something objectively measurable and therefore more easily comparable is a common problem in any research that involves social categorization and perceptual judgments (p. 288).

She also has quite an extended discussion of language attitude surveys. Throughout her book, Romaine stresses that attitudes towards one language or another, towards bilingualism and towards code-switching generally will all affect an individual’s language choice in a given situation, and a community’s propensity (or not) for language shift. For instance, she discusses instrumental vs. integrative orientations in language attitude, defining instrumental as "motivated by factors such as the utility of the language," while integrative is learning or using a language to be able to "interact with speakers of that language and share in their culture" (pp. 43-44); i.e., for reasons of solidarity.

Later she discusses two aspects of attitudes towards bilingualism: "the attitudes of bilinguals towards aspects of bilingual behavior, such as code-switching, and the status it is assigned in the community repertoire. Secondly, there is the question of the attitudes of monolinguals to bilinguals and to various aspects of bilingualism, such as bilingual education" (chapter 7). She also addresses the flexibility of attitudes, asserting "Attitudes do not necessarily remain constant over time." (p. 314). Also, it is possible for bilinguals to have ambivalent attitudes towards their own bilingualism, which can also confound investigations: "In certain contexts where bilingualism is not valued by society at large, bilinguals may experience difficulty in defining their identity. For immigrants, in particular, the feeling of not belonging entirely to either of the cultures whose language they speak, may be disturbing" (pp. 314-315).

Finally, she makes the same distinction as numerous other researchers regarding attitude versus behavior. A person may claim to have a certain attitude about something, but behave in a manner inconsistent with the claimed attitude or belief: "Most public opinion polls actually show a gap between what people claim they support in principle and what they are actually prepared to do" (p. 317).

In contrast to the discussions of some other researchers, Sadanand (1993) notes similarities between mentalist and behaviorist perspectives:

Despite acute differences in the definition of attitude and attitude structure of behaviourists and mentalists, there seems to be a consensus on some aspects of attitudes. For example, everyone agrees

---

3 Romaine offers the example of the Irish learning English, "where the necessity of using English has overpowered antipathy towards English and English speakers. The adoption of English by the Irish is a case of language shift not accompanied by favorable attitudes towards English (see Macnamara 1973). In instances such as these, an instrumental rather than integrative orientation is more important in determining the speakers' choice" (p. 43).
that attitudes are learned from previous experience and that they are not momentary but relatively 'enduring' ... Many theorists also agree that attitudes bear some positive relation to action or behaviour either as being 'predisposition to behaviour' or as being a special aspect of behaviour itself. ... Attitudes towards the use of different languages are motivated by people's perception of the role of each language and the functions it performs in relation to each other language (pp. 123-124).

Saville-Troike (1989) talks about language attitude from the ethnographer's perspective, outlining areas of interest such as the marking of social roles through speech registers ("speaking well"), the relationship between attitudes towards languages or varieties and perceptions of different social categories, and "how such perceptions influence interaction within and across the boundaries of a speech community." She notes that such studies not only contribute "to our understanding of functions and patterns of language use," but also help explain language maintenance and shift. She characterizes three types of language attitude studies:

(1) those which explore general attitudes toward language and language skills (e.g., which languages or varieties are better than others, to what extent literacy is valued, etc.); (2) those which explore stereotyped impressions toward language, their speakers, and their functions; and (3) those which focus on applied concerns (e.g., language choice and usage, and language learning). Underlying each are questions of the nature of language attitudes, their causes, and their effects (p. 181).

Importantly, she points out that attitudes are seldom chosen; they are typically acquired as a factor of group membership, as part of the process of enculturation in a particular speech community, and thus [are] basic to its characterization. ... It is because attitudes toward communicative performance are generally culturally determined that they are so strongly influenced by the social structure of the community in question. ... While Whorf said that the structure of language may influence social structure, interaction, and thinking. [sic] Hymes suggests that the social structure may influence our attitudes toward particular kinds of language (pp. 181-182).

Furthermore, she discusses the revealing nature of particular linguistic expressions that refer to language and language use. Such usages can lead to inferences regarding "appropriate speech" for specific genders or social classes, the nature and function of language, or even a person's social status within the community (e.g., terms such as braggart, liar, gossip, big-mouth, eloquent, pedantic, tactful, etc.). For instance, "complaints about what is changing usually reveal attitudes about what has been valued as it was" (pp. 184-186).

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

1.1. Synopsis of Definitions of Language Attitudes

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

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

For the purposes of a language attitude survey, however, the most applicable definitions are those that focus on the individual speaker's attitudes towards his own language use. Since the objective of a language attitude survey is to find out how a given population of speakers feels about some aspect of their own or some other local language, the wider perspectives that deal with issues of language planning, for instance, are not so relevant. The definitions examined above can help to direct the focus of the questions in the survey by making us more aware of the many directions that language attitude can take. This realization makes it easier to design a line of questioning that avoids issues that are not important to us specifically because both the relevant and irrelevant issues are at a conscious level in our awareness.
2. Definitions of Language Choice

Language attitude differs from language choice, which has to do with what language, variety, or register, etc. a speaker chooses to use in a given situation. As with attitudes, a number of researchers have discussed language choice. Li (1994), for instance, starts with the most basic of observations: "language choice may occur at several different levels, ranging from small-scale phonetic variables such as the ones studied by Labov (1966, 1972a) to large scale discourse patterns such as address systems, conversation routines (e.g., greetings and partings), politeness strategies, and of course choices between languages" (p. 6).

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

In reference to the unconscious choices bilinguals make in code-switching, they list six possible functions that the switching might serve. The referential function, or topic-related switching, “often involves lack of knowledge of one language or lack of facility in that language on a certain subject.” Alternatively, speakers may feel that “[c]ertain subjects may be more appropriately discussed in one language … In addition, a specific word from one of the languages involved may be semantically more appropriate for the given concept. … This type of switching is the one that bilingual speakers are most conscious of” (p. 118). The directive function serves to involve the hearer in some way, either by being included or excluded by the switch to the other language. In the expressive function, “[s]peakers emphasize a mixed identity through the use of two languages in the same discourse. … For fluent bilingual Puerto Ricans in New York, conversation full of code switching is a mode of speech by itself, and individual switches no longer have a discourse function” (p. 119). The phatic function indicates a change in the tone of the conversation, and is also known as metaphorical switching (e.g., Gumperz and Hernández-Chavez, 1975). “The metalinguistic function of code switching comes into play when it is used to comment directly or indirectly on the languages involved. One example of this function is when speakers switch between different codes to impress the other participants with a show of linguistic skills” (p. 120). Finally, the poetic function of language involves use of bilingual switching for puns, jokes, and other types of verbal play (p. 120).

Bentahila (1983) discusses the range of language varieties that any speaker—not only bilinguals—has at his or her disposal to most appropriately fulfill communicative tasks. This range of choices is known as a linguistic repertoire:

The speaker’s ability to choose the appropriate variety for any particular purpose is part of his communicative competence; the choice is not random, but has been shown to be determined by aspects of the social organization of the community and the social
situation where the discourse takes place. In this the bilingual is not strikingly different from the monolingual; it is simply that he has to choose not only between different varieties of the same language, but also between his two languages (p. 50).

He indicates that a number of factors may influence the choice of language, ranging from individual speaker preferences, to the languages themselves and the associations they hold, to specific aspects of the particular social situation, and that different factors may carry different weights for the speaker (pp. 51-52).

Coulmas (1997) echoes some of this reasoning, indicating that language choices serve specific purposes ranging from simple communication of ideas to showing group identification or even to establish social hierarchies. At the same time, he notes that there is a certain degree of inevitability in language choice:

Although it is obvious that people are endowed with the ability to adjust their linguistic repertoires to ever new circumstances, languages are for certain purposes constructed as if they were a matter of destiny, an autonomous power quite beyond the control of their speakers, both as individuals and groups. In this connection the notion of the mother tongue plays a crucial role, as it is more often than not understood as an entity which exists in its own right rather than merely a first skill to be supplemented throughout one’s lifetime with others according to one’s needs. (p. 31).

Edwards (1994) cites the example of Paraguay, where more than 90% of the population is bilingual in Spanish and Guarani. He avers, “Language choice is non-random, and heavily influenced by external constraints” (p. 72).

Fasold (1987) elaborates on the matter by categorizing three kinds of language choice: (1) “whole languages”, or the choice between two languages in a conversation, also known as code-switching; (2) code-mixing, “where pieces of one language are used while a speaker is basically using another language”; these pieces can be single words or short phrases; and (3) variation within the same language. “This is the kind of language choice that often becomes the focus of attitude studies ... In these cases, a speaker must choose which set of variants to use within a single language in any given situation.” This implies, of course, choices for monolinguals as well as bilinguals. At the same time, it should be noted that these three options are not always clearly discrete choices, but rather, points on a continuum from relatively large-scale to relatively small-scale choices. The middle category, code-mixing, is very difficult to distinguish from the other two” (pp. 180-181).

He also discusses three disciplines that offer differing approaches for studying language choices: sociology and domain analysis, introduced by J. Fishman (1964, 1965, 1968e), who also proposed the concept of domains of language use (institutional contexts in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another); social psychology (SP), which focuses
more on individual psychological processes than on larger-scale societal categories; and anthropology, which is “most interested in discovering the values of a sociocultural group, and the cultural rules of behavior that reveal those values” (p. 192).

He explains domains as “constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants [e.g., the family domain].” Different domains imply different degrees of formality or informality, and the concept of domain analysis is often used to categorize degrees of diglossia. For instance, “[i]n a community with diglossia, the Low language is the one that will be selected in the family domain, whereas the High language will most often be used in a more formal domain, perhaps education” (p. 183).

He differentiates sociology from social psychology in terms of scale. Where sociologists are more concerned with social structure (such as domains), i.e., larger-scale units, social psychologists are more interested in the individual, seeking out individual motivations rather than social structures. In other words, social psychological research on language choice is more person-centered than society-centered” (p. 187).

Herman’s research on overlapping situations is one important SP approach. There are three kinds of psychological situations, one that has to do with the speaker’s own needs, and the other two related in some way to the social group. If a bilingual speaker finds herself in more than one psychological situation at the same time, she "may feel herself pulled in different directions by her personal desire to speak the language she knows best and the language expected of her by the social group" (Fasold, 1987, p. 187).

Giles’s accommodation theory is another SP approach. This posits that in a typical situation, a speaker will accommodate his interlocutor by converging, or choosing a language or variety that suits the interlocutor’s needs. However, there are some situations where the speaker may choose not to converge, or may even diverge; that is, make no accommodations whatsoever for the needs of the interlocutor:

[She] might even deliberately make his speech maximally unlike the other person’s. This will happen when the speaker wants to emphasize his loyalty to his own group and dissociate himself from his interlocutor’s group. … Convergence and divergence do not require the selection of one choice (that is, convergence, nonconvergence, and divergence). It is possible to make numerous combinations of choices among the variants within a language, as well as to use strategies such as translating portions of one’s discourse or slowing down the rate of speech (pp. 188-189).

Anthropology, like social psychology, looks at the individual in the context of the structure of his society, “but not in terms of his own psychological needs so much as how that person is using his language choices to reveal his cultural values. Since an individual can make different selections among the values allowed her by her culture at different times, anthropologists are interested in the minute analysis of particular interactions.” Anthropologists view code-mixing and inherent variations, as
well as large-scale code-switches as "a change in the expression of cultural values, and this is what it is important to understand." Anthropologists also use a different methodology from the other two groups of researchers; where sociologists and social psychologists tend to rely on data from questionnaires and experiments, "[a]nthropologists place the highest value on normal, uncontrolled behavior" (pp. 192-193). For this reason, their favored methodology is participant observation, living and participating in the community they are studying.

Ferguson (1996) discusses language choice more in its "official" context of language planning and policy:

Many countries ..., as a matter of national development or even of national existence, must answer a set of language questions. The policy decisions which these answers constitute then require implementation, often on a large scale and over long periods of time. ... Some of these questions are of language choice: What language(s) shall be the official language(s) of the government, used in laws, administration, and the armed forces? What language(s) shall be used as medium of instruction at the various levels of the educational system? What language(s) will be accepted for use on the radio, in publishing, in telegrams, and as school subjects? ... Decisions on language questions are notoriously influenced by emotional issues such as tribal, regional and religious identification, national rivalries, preservation of elites, and so on. They may even go directly against all evidence of feasibility (pp. 272-273).

Gal (1979) studied the bilingual population of Oberwart, Austria for a number of years, and observed that in bilingual situations, the more linguistically significant and socially important decision was that of which language to speak, rather than any stylistic differences (register, tone, etc.) within the language chosen.

Yet in Oberwart there is a great deal of variation in the outcome of language choices. What appears to be the usual pattern for one speaker in a range of situations is rarely the same as anyone else's pattern. In fact, the nature of this variability renders static models of bilingual language use inadequate to the task of describing it. It is more useful to extend to language choice a model of variation derived from recent theories that link synchronic linguistic heterogeneity to diachronic change. In this way it is possible to describe Oberwart's present patterns of language choice so that they can be understood as both the products of social-historical forces and the sources of future changes in language choice (p. 97).

Gal considers that the attitudes the speakers have are part of what makes choice between languages more socially important than style-shifting within a given language.

Romaine (1995) refers to language choice as alternation or code-switching, but where Gal sees it as an acceptable choice governed by social
circumstances, Romaine considers both code-switching and code-mixing to be stigmatized activities in nearly every community where it occurs (p. 5). She offers a formal definition in chapter 4:

“[C]ode-switching” ... in the sense in which Gumperz (1982: 59) has defined it [is] “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems.” In code-switched discourse, the items in question form part of the same speech act. ... [T]his kind of behavior can and routinely does occur in both monolingual and bilingual communities. Thus, ... the term 'code' here ... refer[s] not only to different languages, but also to varieties of the same language as well as styles within a language. This means that at the pragmatic level, all linguistic choices can be seen as indexical of a variety of social relations, rights and obligations which exist and are created between participants in a conversation. ... There is an almost one-to-one relationship between language choice and social context, so that each variety can be seen as having a distinct place or function within the local speech repertoire (p. 121).

Code switching can be viewed from either a grammatical or a pragmatic perspective: the grammatical perspective attempts to account for linguistic constraints on code-switching; the pragmatic view proposes that switches are generally stylistic "and that code-switching is to be treated as a discourse phenomenon which cannot be satisfactorily handled in terms of the internal structure of sentences" (p. 121).

Romaine also addresses code-switching with regard to domains of use. She describes a study of a Puerto Rican community in New York City carried out by Fishman, Cooper and Ma (1971), in which five specific domains are identified in which either Spanish or English was consistently used. "These domains served as anchor points for distinct value systems embodied in the use of Spanish as opposed to English. A domain is an abstraction which refers to a sphere of activity representing a combination of specific times, settings and role relationships. [... E]ach of these domains carried different expectations for using Spanish or English." In other words, an appropriate language for a given domain is a value judgment.

Many of the above observations and conclusions (Romaine’s and others’) would seem to imply that language choice may be a conscious decision in a given situation. Despite such assumptions, however, and all the theories offered for reasons for switching, research shows that code-switching and language choice in a given interaction are not necessarily under the speaker’s conscious control. While the reasons proposed for switches may well be valid ones, the language choice made is not necessarily a conscious one: "In [many] cases the bilingual may use the other language without actually being aware of doing so" (p. 95).

Saville-Troike (1989) is another researcher who seems to assume conscious decision-making on the part of the speaker:
Given the multiple varieties of language available within the communicative repertoire of a community, and the subset of varieties available to its subgroups and individuals, speakers must select a code and interaction strategy to be used in any specific context. Knowing the alternatives and the rules for appropriate choice from among them are part of speakers' communicative competence (p. 50).

However, it must be remembered that communicative competence is something that tends to manifest at the subconscious level. Competence implies “just knowing” the right choices to make in a given situation without having to think about it. As Saville-Troike (1989) herself says, "Rules for language choice are usually not consciously formulated by native speakers" (p. 54).

The concept of domain also plays an important role in her explanation of linguistic choice, and she uses Fishman's (1971) definition of domain: "a socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community" (p. 587). Other elements that can play a role in language or variety choice include focus of the interaction (e.g., societal-institutional vs. social-psychological); topic of the conversation; and setting and participants of the interaction.

Similarly to Romaine, Saville-Troike (1989) identifies various types of code-switching. She identifies two types in particular. A situational switch occurs "when the language change accompanies a change of topics or participants" (p. 59), while a metaphorical switch occurs within a single situation, but adds meaning to such components as the role-relationships which are being expressed. Since speaking different languages is an obvious marker of differential group membership, by switching languages bilinguals often have the option of choosing which group to identify with in a particular situation, and thus can convey the metaphorical meaning which goes along with such choice (p. 60).

Sridhar (1996) essentially recaps what everyone else has been saying. As he notes (in agreement with others), the question "Who uses what language with whom and for what purposes?" (p. 51) pertains primarily to bi- or multilingual individuals and implies the availability to them of linguistic choices and reasons for choosing one code from among several. He quotes a basic assumption of sociolinguistics regarding multilingual speech communities from Elias-Olivares (1979, p. 121): "In a heterogeneous speech community, with varying degrees of linguistic diversity and social complexity, speakers interact using different speech varieties drawn from a repertoire of choices which for the most part are not random. On the contrary, the distribution of usage of these choices is determined by several factors in the social communicative system of the community." He concurs that language domains are a very important concept in explaining or defining language choice.
2.1. Synopsis of Definitions of Language Choice

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

While I personally agree that language choice can be exercised by either monolinguals or bilinguals, for the purposes of developing a language survey, a focus on bilinguals is more appropriate. Again, as with the discussions of language attitude, having these various issues of language choice brought to our conscious attention will make us more able to design an effective language survey.

3. Definitions of Language Shift

Language shift is very different from either attitude or choice, since it has to do with the complete change, whether gradual or sudden, of an entire speech community from one language to another (Crystal, 1997, p. 215; Edwards, 1994, p. 102), “without retaining the first in some bidialectal or bilingual accommodation” (Edwards, 1994, p. 102). Hornberger and King (1982) assert that “[t]his occurs most typically where there is a sharp difference in prestige and in the level of official support for the two (or more) languages concerned” (p. 300), while Gal (1979) believes that “[g]iven [the] social determinants of language shift, the process of shift, once it starts, is very much the same as other kinds of linguistic change. It consists of the socially motivated redistribution of synchronic variants to different speakers and different social environments” (p. 17).

Schiffman (1990) adds the importance of domains to the mix: "[L]anguage shift occurs domain by domain (rather than speaker by speaker or community by community), until the abandoned language controls no domains at all" (p. 1) while Tabouret-Keller (1968) outlines Fishman’s attempt to define language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: "[i]t is concerned with the relationship between change or stability in habitual language use, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social or cultural processes, on the other hand, when populations differing in language are in contact with each other" (p. 107). Finally, Wiley (1996) points out that it can be either "a gradual process, or it can be explicitly planned” (p. 122). There
are many reasons why shift might occur, and these reasons are the focus of this section.

Appel & Muysken (1987) offer one of the most commonly accepted reasons for language shift in bilingual communities: the hope for greater upward social mobility and better earning opportunities. They note that this common reason for language shift often gives the impression that shift always implies a change towards the majority language or prestige variety, but in fact 'shift' is a neutral concept, and also shift towards the extended use of the minority language can be observed. ... After a period of shift towards the majority language, there is often a tendency to reverse the process, because some people come to realize that the minority language is disappearing, and they try to promote its use. These defenders of the minority language are often young, active members of cultural and political organizations that stand up for the social, economic and cultural interests of the minority group (p. 32). They also note that knowing about the factors which govern language maintenance and shift does not necessarily equate to understanding its process in a given situation, “since people bring this about in their daily speech, and it is on this level that explanations for shift must be found” (pp. 32-33). The authors go on to explain the general outlines of the process, making the relationship between language shift, loss, and death: “When a language is reduced in its function, which happens in the case of shift towards the majority language, generally speakers will become less proficient in it, i.e. language loss is taking place. Language shift linked up with loss will finally result in language death” (pp. 32-33). They note that such shift, loss and death may take place very slowly, over generations, or more rapidly, particularly in the face of rapidly changing social contexts, such as with immigrant groups, where a complete language shift from the mother tongue to the dominant language of the adoptive country can take place in as little as three generations. They cite Tosi’s (1984) study of bilingualism and language shift among Italian immigrants to Bedford, England:

The first-generation immigrants generally use a local Italian dialect as the principal medium of communication within the family. Until school age, their children mostly speak this dialect, only occasionally switching to English, and when there are several children in the household they often speak English among themselves. But English really gains influence when the children go to school and become more proficient in it. English will then inevitably be brought into the household: initially for use mainly with other siblings, but later also in interactions with the parents. A younger person will gradually learn to understand that the two languages are associated with two different value systems, and that these systems often collide with each other. This results in personal and emotional conflicts. ...

The general pattern for language shift in immigrant groups is as follows. The first generation (born in the country of origin) is bilingual, but the minority language is clearly dominant, the second generation
is bilingual and either of the two languages might be strongest, the
third generation is bilingual with the majority language dominating,
and the fourth generation only has command of the majority language.
This is only a general pattern, and the picture for specific immigrant
groups is different. (Appel & Muysken, 1987, pp. 41-42).

Wiley (1996) discusses similar findings in the United States, based on
Veltman’s (1983) analysis of census data. Veltman also estimated a three-
generation shift process from monolingualism in the original native language
to monolingualism in English. However, Wiley and others take some issue
with some of Veltman’s assumptions: “Most curious is his exclusion of
bilingualism as a circumstance equal to monolingualism. If bilingualism is
not considered, language shift is seen as an either–or phenomenon toward a
language rather than toward multilingualism” (pp. 122-123).

Baker (1996) emphasizes the importance of politics and hegemonic
power in language shift or maintenance, and argues that it is possible to
analyze the causes of language shift, rather than merely assuming an
evolutionary perspective; i.e., survival of the (linguistically) “fittest,” and thus
majority languages are “fated” to succeed while minority languages are
“fated” to die):

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

Like Appel and Muysken (1987), he notes that shift is generally viewed as
having a negative value; i.e., always assuming that shift is “a downwards
language movement [: …] a lessening of the number of speakers of a
language, a decreasing saturation of language speakers in the population, a
loss in language proficiency, or a decreasing use of that language in different
domains” (p. 43), leading to loss and death. Some factors influencing
language shift include out-migration and in-migration, possible forced or
voluntary movement of minority language groups within a particular
geographical region, or intermarriage between different language
communities. "With the growth of mass communications, information
technology, tourism, road, sea and air links, minority languages seem more
at risk. Bilingual education, or its absence, will also be a factor in the ebb
and flow of minority and majority languages” (p. 44).
Fasold (1987) stresses the more conscious nature of language shift or maintenance as two sides of the coin of language choice. This seems to fly somewhat in the face of the conclusions of the previous section, in which we noted that most researchers agree that choice is not necessarily a conscious decision:

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

He further notes a series of conditions that may influence shift, and it is in experiencing these conditions where perhaps the less conscious level of choice comes into play. For instance, societal bilingualism (which he notes as a necessary but not sufficient condition for shift) may predispose speakers to prefer one language over the other in specific domains. Another condition is one of intergenerational switching, where the older generations may be more inclined to use one language (often the minority one), while the younger generations prefer the dominant one. This is in line with what Appel and Muysken (1987) described above in the Bedford, UK study of Italian immigrants. Other causes consistently found in various studies include migration, both in-migration and out-migration (as Baker also noted); industrialization and other economic changes; school language and other government pressures; urbanization; higher prestige for the language being shifted to; and smaller population of speakers of the language being shifted from. He adds, "however, where the same factors were cited independently by many scholars, there has been very little success in using any combination of them to predict when language shift will occur" (p. 217). At the same time, he does not completely rule out being able to predict cases of language maintenance or shift:

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

Jaspaert & Kroon (1988) present a slightly different perspective of language shift, looking at it from the individual's point of view rather than from that of the speech community as a whole:

It is not the purpose of this project to study the intergenerational process of language shift, but the shift that takes place when individuals decide to use the newly acquired language instead of their
mother tongue. Central to our understanding of the phenomenon is that shift can only occur in those instances in which the individual has a choice. The observation that an Italian immigrant who used to speak Italian to the doctor in Italy now speaks Dutch to the doctor in the Netherlands is interesting from an intragenerational point of view when the doctor in the Netherlands also masters Italian (p. 158).

Such a perspective does not follow the most commonly accepted definition of language shift, which certainly does have an intergenerational component, but rather conflates the term 'language shift' with the individual nature of language choice. In this sense, I think that their use of the term is misleading and possibly confusing in a field where concrete definitions of these terms are hard enough to come by.

Richards et al. (1992) present a laundry list of possible reasons for shift, including some of the ones listed above, including migration to another country with a different language, official government policy (e.g., "by restricting the number of languages used as media of instruction" [p. 205]), social mobility or employment opportunities, or because of the language of wider communication in their country (pp. 204-205). They also stress that "language shift should not be confused with language change." Note here how Richards et al. specifically exclude the idea that Jaspaert and Kroon are trying to establish. It would seem that researchers in general are more in agreement with Richards et al.'s definition than with Jaspaert and Kroon's, since none of the others try to explain language shift on the individual level.

Romaine (1995) identifies three elements important to language maintenance of ethnic groups within a larger group with a dominant language (e.g., English in the US); conversely, of course, a lack in any of these areas can affect language shift to the dominant language from the ethnic one: institutional support, status, and demographic concentration (p. 39). In some cases (not all), "language shift involves bilingualism (often with diglossia) as a stage on the way to monolingualism in a new language" (p. 40). Key external factors which can influence (but not necessarily cause) language maintenance, shift or death include "numerical strength of the group in relation to other minorities and majorities, social class, religious and educational background, settlement patterns, ties with the homeland, degree of similarity between the minority and majority language, extent of exogamous marriage, attitudes of majority and minority, and patterns of language use" (p. 40).

---

Richards et al. define language change as "change in a language which takes place over time. All living languages have changed and continue to change. For example, in English, changes which have recently been occurring include the following: (a) the distinction in pronunciation between words such as what and Watt is disappearing; (b) hopefully may be used instead of I hope, we hope, it is to be hoped; (c) new words and expressions are constantly entering the language, e.g., drop-out, alternative society, culture shock" (pp. 199-200). Note that this definition refers to evolution within a single language rather than changing between two languages.
Saville-Troike (1989) focuses on the importance of instrumental versus affective (what Romaine calls integrative) functions of language in language maintenance or shift:

The surest symptom of impending language loss is ... when parents no longer see a reason to transmit it to their children, and may even view it as a handicap to their children's education and advancement ... Language loyalty persists so long as the economic and social circumstances are conducive to it; but if some other language proves to have greater value, a shift to that other language begins (p. 206).

In her own discussion of factors involved in language maintenance or shift, she highlights the importance of Fishman's (1972, 1985) language domains: "Stability of multiple languages in contact ... occurs where each has a unique domain ... and is thus reserved a continuing function in society" (p. 206). She also cites

- the social organization and ecology of the community or communities involved, and attitudes related to these factors. This may include the nature of their boundary mechanisms and political organization ... It is not coincidental that the more 'visible' minorities [immigrants to the United States], who have encountered negative attitudes towards their assimilation from the dominant groups, are most likely to have maintained separate linguistic and cultural identity (pp. 209-210).

Likewise, forced assimilation might encourage maintenance, while “[i]mperialistic expansion may also result in language spread, as evidenced in history by periods of expansion and then contraction of Turkish, Quechua, Nahuatl, and Portuguese” (pp. 206-207). Such spread often involves shifting from another, previous language, rather than merely adding a new language to the community's repertoire. Marriage and kinship patterns also affect maintenance or shift, as do gender roles. “Where [women] are uneducated and remain in the home they tend to remain monolingual and contribute to maintenance of the 'mother' tongue; where they are educated, bilingual, and participate in trade or other external activities, exactly the opposite has been observed” (p. 208).

Demographics can also play a role in shift. For instance, “Frequently the community itself is transformed along with the linguistic switch. That is, only as the community is surrounded and absorbed into a larger community, does it tend to drop its old language and to take on that of a larger group” (Swadesh 1948: 234; qtd. in Saville-Troike, 1989, p. 208). Likewise, the ubiquity of modern technology and penetration of mass media can propel shift, as can social stratification; the greater access that low-prestige language speakers have to higher prestige varieties, the more likely they are to make use of them, particularly if a job depends on their use. “On this dimension, attitudes toward the desirability of change play a major role” (p. 208). On the other hand, geographic or social segregation can have the opposite effect, encouraging maintenance.

Finally, Saville-Troike (1989) notes that values and cosmovision can play an important role in maintenance or shift. If one’s culture places a high
value on the mother tongue, the speakers are much more likely to maintain it. "In a broad sense, this includes attitudes toward borrowing foreign words, and the value placed on uniqueness versus homogeneity" (pp. 208-209).

Sommer (1997) emphasizes that shift is a communal phenomenon rather than an individual one: "The process of language shift [is] defined as the replacement of one language in the repertoire of a community-wide bilingual group by another one" (p. 55). Her explanation of the nature of shift is very similar to the others we have seen thus far:

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

3.1. Synopsis of Definitions of Language Shift

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

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

4. Critical review of the literature on language attitude surveys

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

As discussed in the section above on language attitudes, the focus of the attitudes can range from a speaker's attitude towards the language in general to his attitude towards speaking it, to others' speech habits, or even towards another language altogether, for instance in learning a second language. All of these various perspectives were represented in the readings I review here, as well as some others such as language attitudes of a speech community in general, and their impact on language policy. In fact, many investigators make reference to language policy and/or language planning, and even discuss it at length in relation to linguistic problems of various regions (e.g., Edwards, 1995; Hae, 1990; Mehrotra, 1985; Omdal, 1995; Schiffman, 1990). But of the works I read, a large majority talked more about the effect of language policy on language usage rather than the effect of language attitude on policy. In this sense, they did not have great applicability to our primary interest in attitudes; nor do they offer much useful information on the development of language questionnaires.

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

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

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

In addition, in an earlier chapter, she offers some sample language attitude questions taken from a survey for Panjabi speakers in Britain.

Fasold (1987) also devotes an entire section to methods of measuring language attitudes. One important point that he makes is the distinction between direct and indirect methods: "A totally direct method would require subjects to respond to a questionnaire or interview questions that simply ask their opinions about one or another language. A totally indirect method would be designed to keep the subject from knowing that her language attitudes were being investigated" (p. 149). Based on the example that he gives, his point seems to be that, while indirect methods may be able to more accurately gauge language attitudes, they are not ideally suited to a questionnaire format. He also discusses open and closed questions on questionnaires, and the advantages or disadvantages of each in obtaining the desired data (p. 152). On the other hand, he also devotes a section to social applications of the study of language attitudes, and the first topic he mentions is group identity (pp. 158-164).

Edwards (1995) offers the interesting point (mentioned above in the definitions of language attitude) that attitudes are often confused with beliefs, and so many purported language attitude surveys are actually language belief surveys. The question he offers as an example is "Is a knowledge of French important for your children, yes or no?" (p. 98). Such a question, he maintains, measure belief more than attitude. Thus, this is important to keep this in mind in wording questions. On the other hand, he offers no other sample surveys or examples of "attitude" questions. Therefore, this one point is the only important contribution his work makes to designing a questionnaire.
Sadanand’s (1993) work on language attitude toward English among laborers in India is potentially more useful. In his article “Assessing attitudes to English and language use”, he outlines in detail his own methodology, as well as offering a description of other possible methodologies and their advantages and disadvantages. In addition, he describes the measurement scale he developed on which to rate the responses of his respondents (pp. 125-127). This provides some ideas to keep in mind when it comes time to tally the results of a questionnaire. He also reproduces his questionnaire as an appendix. Unfortunately, all of the questions fall into the trap described by Edwards above; that is, they actually measure beliefs rather than attitudes. It might be possible to modify some of them, but it is not a guaranteed outcome. So his measurement scale is perhaps the most significant aspect to contribute to an attitude questionnaire design. Another team of researchers who fall into the same trap is Jaspaert and Kroon (1988); they transcribe the six questions which constitute the “attitudinal component of the questionnaire,” and only one of the questions actually measures attitude instead of beliefs: "I'd much rather use Dutch than Italian." All of the other questions ask respondents to rate their beliefs about the beauty or utility of one language over the other, which as Edwards indicates, do not really require them to take a personal stand on any issue.

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

Saville-Troike (1989) is another author who offers an overview of language attitude survey methods. Unfortunately, it is a very general overview, and reveals no concrete information that can be directly used in designing a questionnaire. Rather, it gives some ideas of pitfalls that should be avoided, and the purposes which different methods serve, which could be useful to keep in mind when designing an attitude survey, but offers no directly useful information such as possible questions. Other investigators offer similar information, describing the types of methods they used to obtain their data and detailing the administration of these methods, but then not offering specific information on the types of questions they asked, for instance, or, what would have been even better, a sample list of questions from their surveys. Among this type of article are those by Appel and Muysken (1987), Bister-Broosen (1997), De Houwer and Wölck (1997), Dua (1986), Ehret (1997), Gorter and Ytisma (1988), Polomé (1990), Sibayan (1975), von Gleich and Wölck (1994), and Weil and Schneider (1997).
Polomé (1990) did, however, raise an important point to keep in mind regarding status of the members of the target population and effective question design:

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

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

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

Haugen (1972) also offers similar useful information in his article. He describes in detail the types and categories of questions he includes in his questionnaire, and offers one or two questions as examples. The real value of his contribution, however, is in how he interprets his data, which offers clues to other researchers as to how they might design and interpret their own surveys. Mohan Lal (1986), in his study of convergence and language shift in Bangalore City, also makes a major contribution to language attitude survey design because he reproduces part of his questionnaire in the text of his study. The part reproduced covers both sociocultural and linguistic usage data on the informants, so not all of it can be directly applied to attitude survey design. Nevertheless, some of the questions will be quite helpful for revealing language usage and perhaps indirectly language attitude. As with other cases, it will also be possible to modify the format or wording of some of the questions to make them more applicable to measurement of language attitudes.

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

there is ... a cline here between more-or-less 'factual' responses and responses largely of the 'opinion' variety (see Fishman 1968), and, in fact, it will be possible for the investigators to check the consistency of many of the responses, by for example correlating place of origin with knowledge of Chinese dialects, or proficiency in English with professed language behavior.

In the literature it has been frequently emphasized ... that whenever possible, self-report measures should be balanced by other, more objective, measures of language proficiency and behavior, including language tests of some kind (p. 50).

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

Of course all of the studies mentioned to this point have had clear research questions in mind to guide the focus of their investigations; without such a focus, it is nearly impossible to design a useful survey. Nevertheless, not all of the researchers are equally adept at explicitly identifying what it is they are looking for, and it is only as one continues to read the work that it becomes obvious what the main point of the study is. Hornberger (1987) and Garcia et al. (1988), however, are exceptions to this lack of specificity. They not only mention the purpose of their investigations, but they both go a step beyond to specifically state the research questions they proposed to investigate. In addition, Hornberger offers an excerpt of her questionnaire in the appendix of her paper. These two details make her paper in particular very useful.

Another source that is probably one of the best resources for the current project is Torres’s (1997) study of Puerto Rican discourse in the New York City area. While her main focus is not language attitudes per se, but rather issues of shift and code-switching, still the work is invaluable because of the information the article contains on language attitudes, since issues of language maintenance and shift necessarily involve attitudes. Also, and perhaps most importantly, in the appendix she reproduces the questionnaire for parents which she used.

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

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

Sreedhar et al. (1984) go one step further than reproducing a questionnaire in their index. They have compiled an entire book which is a questionnaire bank for sociolinguistic surveys in India. Such a question bank should be invaluable in suggesting directions for questions and how to word them. Obviously, since their context is India, questions cannot be simply copied from their survey into a new one. However, it should be a fairly simple matter of modifying the wording to fit a different context.

Another text which may be useful to a limited degree is Davies's (1995) study of linguistic variation and attitudes in Mannheim-Neckarau. In the body of her text she explains her questionnaire and interviewing procedures, which can be helpful for others designing such surveys. She also reproduces her questionnaire in an appendix; unfortunately, it is all in German, without a translation, and so much of its utility for many readers is lost. On the other hand, in another appendix she offers what she calls linguistic biographies of her informants, which are written in English. In these, she does offer their responses to some attitude and belief questions; from these, it should be possible to infer the original question asked.

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

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

5. Language Attitude Surveys

The design of the following instruments has been guided by the following general research questions, based on a previous project of mine. The hope is that these can serve as models to readers on how to design their own research questions, and that the following surveys offer ideas for their own survey questions.

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

2. What is the relationship between language use at home, at school and in the community?

3. How are spoken and written Spanish and English actually taught and/or used at school, at home, and in the local community?

Question 1 deals specifically with language beliefs and attitudes of a range of community members. Question 2, on the other hand, pertains more to language use patterns. These patterns will be best revealed by having different surveys geared specifically towards each of the different subpopulations to be measured (i.e., parents and community members, versus students). Many of the questions on the two surveys are the same, but at the same time, enough are different so that informants will not have to wade through questions that are obviously not pertinent to one group or the other. Also, by having a different survey for each group, a distinct picture comes out of the perspectives of each group, and they can then be compared across groups to come up with a coherent picture of the community. This same approach was used by various of the researchers on whose work I relied in constructing the present questionnaires (e.g., Torres, 1997; Adegbija, 1994; Sreedhar et al., 1984).

Question 3 is not one that can be easily investigated in the direct framework of a questionnaire, but rather, through other triangulated data collection methods such as observation in the community and the classroom, examination of school documentation (e.g., curricula, etc.) and interpretation of the data generated by the questionnaires. For this reason, there are no questions on the surveys that seek to directly respond to this question. Rather, the questions on the surveys are geared more toward seeking answers to questions 1 and 2 above.

Some of the questions in the following surveys were taken directly from the following sources, or are modified versions of their questions: Adegbija (1994, appendix), Ansre (1975, appendix 1), Bentahila (1983, p. 141), Gal
Numerous other questions were developed independently of these sources, based on a need in the questionnaire not filled by these other sources. Due to space constraints, it was decided not to footnote each question to indicate its source, especially since many of the questions appear either identically or in similar form in several different sources (e.g., personal history and language use questions). I also decided to divide the questionnaires into three sections to make the different types of information easier to locate in tallying, and also to make it possible to differentiate between language use and language attitudes in the final results. The three sections are personal history data, language use questions, and language attitude questions. The majority of the sources mentioned above did not make these kinds of divisions in their questionnaires (except for perhaps differentiating personal information from anything related to linguistic data). Also, in some of the surveys that did have separate divisions for language use vs. language attitudes, it was apparent from the mix of questions in a given section that it is not always easy to distinguish between use and attitude (and similarly, as discussed in a previous section, between attitudes and beliefs). Frequently I found questions relating to attitude (according to the various definitions listed in the first section of this document) included in sections on language use. I have tried to the best of my ability to differentiate strictly between use (behaviors) and attitudes (including beliefs) in placing the questions in their appropriate sections.

5.1. Language Attitude Survey for Parents and Community Members

Personal Information
1. Age range: □ 16-20 □ 21-25 □ 26-30 □ 31-40 □ 41-50 □ 51-60 □ 60+
2. Sex: □ Male □ Female
3. Occupation ____________________________
4. Place of birth ____________________________
5. Town or neighborhood where you live now ____________________________
6. How many years have you lived here? ____________________________
7. Where did you live before you moved here? ____________________________
8. Why did you move to the United States? ____________________________
9. How many years did you attend school? ____________________________
10. Where did you attend school (city/country)? ____________________________
11. Where was your father born? ____________________________
12. What language does/did he speak as his first language? ____________________________
13. Where was your mother born? ____________________________
14. What language does/did she speak as her first language? ____________________________
15. Do you have children? Yes __ No __
16. Do they speak the same language(s) that you do? Yes __ No __
   If not, which languages do they know that you do not? ____________________________
   Which languages do you know that they do not? ____________________________
17. How do you identify yourself? (check all that apply or add your own)
Language use of parents (self)

18. What languages do you speak?

19. What language did you learn first?

   English _____  Spanish _____  Learned them both together _____

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

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

   Spanish  English

   At home  _______  _______

   At school ___  ___

   In the neighborhood ___  ___

   At work ___  ___

   From friends ___  ___

   Through movies/television ___  ___

   In your respective country of origin ___  ___

   In the United States ___  ___

   Other ____________________________  ____________________________

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

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

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

   in elementary school: ____________________________  in high school: ____________________________

   in college: ____________________________

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

   in elementary school: ____________________________  in high school: ____________________________

   in college: ____________________________

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

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

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

29. Which language do you understand better?

   Spanish _____  English _____  Both more or less equally ______

30. What language do you speak better?

   Spanish _______  English ____  Both more or less equally _______

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

   Spanish _________  English _______  Both more or less equally _______

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

   Spanish _________  English _______  Both more or less equally _______

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

   Spanish _________  English ____  Both more or less equally _______

34. Do you dream in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _________  English ____  Both more or less equally _______

35. Do you pray in Spanish or in English?

   Spanish _____  English _____  Both more or less equally ______

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

   Spanish _____  English _____  Both more or less equally ______

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

   Spanish _____  English _____  Both more or less equally ______
38. If you swear (curse), in what language do you swear?
   Spanish _____  English _____  Both more or less equally _____

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

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

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

   (a) at home:
   spouse ___________  mother ___________  uncles/aunts ___________
   children ___________  siblings ___________  cousins ___________
   father ___________  grandparents ___________  nephews/nieces ___________
   friends ___________  others ___________

   (b) outside the home:
   spouse ___________  grandparents ___________  boss ___________
   children ___________  uncles/aunts ___________  co-workers ___________
   father ___________  cousins ___________  strangers ___________
   mother ___________  nephews/nieces ___________  others? ___________
   siblings ___________  friends ___________

   (c) in specific social domains:
   market/stores ___________  festivals ___________  church ___________
   post office ___________  social gathering places ___________  
   other places you commonly visit ___________

   (d) under specific emotional circumstances:
   extremely angry ___________  anxious ___________  overjoyed ___________
   surprised ___________  terrified ___________  overstressed ___________
   extremely happy ___________  hurt ___________  begging for help ___________
   very embarrassed ___________

   (e) specific topics of conversation:
   with family  with friends/neighbors  with co-workers  with others
   work ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________
   business ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________
   travel ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________
   politics ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________
   religion ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________
   health ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________
   music ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________
   family matters ___________  ___________  ___________  ___________

Language use of children

42. What languages do your children speak?

43. What language did your children learn first?
   English _____  Spanish _____  Learned them both together _____

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

45. In what contexts did your children learn Spanish?  In what contexts did they learn English?  Check all that apply.
   Spanish  English
   At home ___________  ___________
   At school ___________  ___________
   In the neighborhood ___________  ___________
At work
From friends
Through movies/television
In your respective country of origin
In the United States
Other

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

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

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

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

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

in elementary school: ____________
in high school: ____________
in college: ____________

51. Can they read in Spanish? Yes _____ No _____ Don’t know _____
52. In English? Yes _____ No _____ Don’t know _____
53. In both languages equally well? Yes _____ No _____ Don’t know _____

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

55. Can they write in Spanish? Yes _____ No _____ Don’t know _____
56. In English? Yes _____ No _____ Don’t know _____
57. In both languages equally well? Yes _____ No _____ Don’t know _____

58. Which language do they understand better?

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

59. What language do they speak better?

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

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

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

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

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

62. Do they dream in Spanish or in English?

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

63. Do they pray in Spanish or in English?

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

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

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

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

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

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

English _____ Spanish _____ Both more or less equally _____ Don’t know _____

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

(a) at home:
mother ____________ grandparents ____________ friends ____________
father ____________ uncles/aunts ____________ boyfriend/girlfriend ____________
siblings ____________ cousins ____________

(b) outside the home:
father ____________ grandparents ____________ friends ____________
mother ____________ uncles/aunts ____________ neighbors ____________
siblings __________ cousins __________ others? __________

(c) under specific emotional circumstances:
- extremely angry __________
- anxious __________
- overjoyed __________
- surprised __________
- terrified __________
- overstressed __________
- extremely happy __________
- hurt __________
- begging for help __________
- very embarrassed __________

(e) specific topics of conversation:
- travel  __________
- politics  __________
- religion  __________
- health  __________
- music  __________
- entertainment  __________
- family matters  __________
- with family  __________
- with friends/neighbors  __________

68. Do you make a special effort with your children to maintain the use of Spanish?
   Yes ______ No ________

69. What does this effort consist of?

70. Do you make a special effort with your children to make them speak English?
   Yes ______ No ________

71. What does this effort consist of?

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

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

Language attitudes and beliefs

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

75. Which language do you *prefer* to speak when you have a choice?
   English ________ Spanish ________ No preference ________

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

77. What are your reasons for this preference?

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precise</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
80. To what degree do you associate the following attributes with speakers of Spanish? of English? Rate them on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 meaning not at all, 2 meaning somewhat, and 3 meaning very much.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>miser</td>
<td></td>
<td>practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimist</td>
<td></td>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td></td>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td>reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orthodox/traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>close knit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultured</td>
<td></td>
<td>educated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td>rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cunning/sly</td>
<td></td>
<td>enterprising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td></td>
<td>fanatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td></td>
<td>liberal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is it different from the Spanish spoken by other Hispanics in the United States? Yes No

82. In either case, how is it different?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>their job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you know these details?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>your job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>your job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86. How would you describe good Spanish? Explain.

87. How would you describe bad Spanish?

88. Do you speak good Spanish? Yes No Explain.

89. How would you describe good English?

90. How would you describe bad English?

91. Do you speak good English? Yes No Explain.

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

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

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

Please give one example:

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

96. Do you ever switch from one to the other during a conversation? Yes No
97. Why do you mix them?

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

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

99. Do you know others who mix languages? Yes No

How do you feel about mixing languages? It is good It is bad

Other response

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

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

101. Indicate the group that you think mixes more:

Hispanics from other LA countries in the US Puerto Ricans

102. Do your children mix the languages? Yes No

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

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

105. Why or why not?

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

107. Why or why not?

108. Who should teach the children Spanish? Parents Schools Both

109. Who should teach the children English? Parents Schools Both

110. Do you have any association or organization in your own community? Yes No

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
112. If you are not a member of such organizations, why not?
   I am not interested ________ They have a narrow-minded outlook ________
   They do not fulfill my needs ________

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(specify) ________

114. Are you a member of any language or community organizations run by other speech communities (i.e., not Hispanic)?

Yes ________ No ________

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

- It is a prestigious group ________
- There is social/political pressure to join ________
- It helps in integration with other groups ________
- Other reasons ________

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

Yes ________ No ________ Don’t know ________

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

- Access to a broader range of cultures ________
- Access to education and science ________
- Access to money and prestige ________
- Source of enriched experience ________
- No advantage ________

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

- Leads to neglect of Spanish and domination of English ________
- Leads to lack of proficiency in both Spanish and English ________
- Leads to contradictions between the two cultures ________
- Leads to mixing of the two languages ________
- Leads to loss of identity ________
- No disadvantage ________

119. Do you regret being bilingual (if you are)?

Yes ________ No ________ No opinion ________

120. Do you think that the prestige of speaking Spanish in the US has improved at all in the last 10 years?

Yes ________ No ________

Why do you think this way? ________

121. Do you think that there should be a greater effort made on the part of policy makers for bilingual education programs in Spanish and English?

Yes ________ No ________

Why or why not? ________

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

________

123. Should Americans be encouraged to learn Spanish?

Yes ________ No ________

If so, why? ________

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

________

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

________

126. Has it ever happened to you that a person who you know can speak Spanish keeps switching back to English when you talk to them?

Yes ________ No ________

127. What is your reaction when this happens? ________
128. Why do you think that some Hispanic children always reply in English even when spoken to in Spanish?

129. Do you think that Hispanic children in the US are losing touch with their culture?
Yes ___________ No ___________ Don’t know ___________

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for getting jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for conducting business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for social mobility and prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for higher salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for promoting religious unity in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for creating a sense of unity within the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for spreading social and cultural values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for science and technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for communication with other communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for integration with other communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for international diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I would accept them as business partners
I would invite them to be a guest in my house
I would like to work with them in the same office, factory or other work environment
I would be friends with them
I would like to have them as a neighbor
I would not object to establishing a relationship with them through marriage
I would accept them as a leader or boss
I would accept them as an assistant
I would rely on them in confidential matters
I would like them as a co-tenant or roommate
I would not mind eating in their house
I would participate with them in sports and games

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

132. To be Hispanic you need to speak Spanish.
133. Hispanics who don’t know Spanish divide the community.
134. All Hispanics should also be able to speak English.
135. I want my children to be bilingual.
136. It is important to communicate in English at home.
137. English is essential for any professional training.
Spanish is changing because of contact with English.

In what way(s) has Spanish changed?

It is important to me to speak Spanish.

Hispanic young people in the US don’t want to speak Spanish.

In what way(s) has English changed?

English is changing because of contact with Spanish.

Hispanics young people in the US don’t know how to speak Spanish well.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I believe that students would learn more effectively if they were taught in their mother tongue.
If not, which languages do they know that you do not?  __________________________________________
Which languages do you know that they do not?  __________________________________________

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

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

Language use

19. What languages do you speak?  __________________________________________

20. What language did you learn first?

English _______  Spanish _______  Learned them both together _________

21. How old were you when you learned Spanish? _______  English? _________

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

in elementary school:  ________________
in high school:  ____________________
in college:  _________________________

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

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

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

31. Which language do you understand better?

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

32. What language do you speak better?

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

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

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

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

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

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

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

36. Do you dream in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

37. Do you pray in Spanish or in English?

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

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

Spanish _______  English _______  Both more or less equally _________

39. Do you tell jokes and stories in Spanish or in English?
40. If you swear (curse), in what language do you swear?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Both more or less equally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

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

(a) at home:  
- mother  
- father  
- siblings  
- grandparents  
- uncles/aunts  
- cousins  
- friends  
- others  

(b) outside the home:  
- father  
- mother  
- siblings  
- uncles/aunts  
- cousins  
- grandparents  
- friends  
- strangers  
- others  

(c) in specific social domains:  
- market/stores  
- festivals  
- church  
- at school during classes  
- at school between classes  
- social gathering places (specify)  
- other places you commonly visit (specify)  

(d) under specific emotional circumstances:  
- extremely angry  
- surprised  
- extremely happy  
- very embarrassed  
- anxious  
- terrified  
- hurt  
- begging for help  
- overjoyed  
- overstressed  

(e) specific topics of conversation:  
- travel  
- politics  
- religion  
- health  
- music  
- entertainment  
- family matters  

Language attitudes and beliefs

44. If you learned to speak Spanish and English at the same time, which of them do you consider to be your mother tongue?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

45. Which language do you prefer to speak when you have a choice?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>No preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

47. What are your reasons for this preference?  

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestigious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammatical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technologically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestigious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammatical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technologically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestigious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammatical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technologically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>miser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orthodox/traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cunning/whimsical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close knit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enterprising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fanatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

52. Is it different from the Spanish spoken by other Hispanics in the US? Yes _____ No _____

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>their job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where they live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>their job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where they live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>their job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where they live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. What is your opinion of the United States?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Do you speak English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>their job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where they live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>their job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where they live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
56. How would you describe good Spanish?

57. How would you describe bad Spanish?

58. Do you speak good Spanish? Yes No

59. How would you describe good English?

60. How would you describe bad English?

61. Do you speak good English? Yes No

62. Are you conscious of your pronunciation of English words and careful about speaking "correct" English?

63. Are you conscious of your pronunciation of Spanish words and careful about speaking "correct" Spanish?

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

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

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

67. Why do you mix them?

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

69. Do you know others who mix languages? Yes No

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

71. Indicate the group that you think mixes more:

Puerto Ricans from the Island
Hispanics from other countries of Latin America?

72. When you have children, is it important to you that they learn Spanish? Yes No
73. Why or why not? 

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

75. Why or why not? 

76. Who should teach children Spanish? Parents ___ Schools ___ Both ___

77. Who should teach children English? Parents ___ Schools ___ Both ___

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

Access to a broader range of cultures ___ Access to education and science ___
Access to money and prestige ___ Source of enriched experience ___
No advantage ___

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

Leads to neglect of Spanish and domination of English ___
Leads to lack of proficiency in both Spanish and English ___
Leads to contradictions between the two cultures ___
Leads to mixing of the two languages ___
Leads to loss of identity ___
No disadvantage ___

80. Do you regret being bilingual (if you are)? Yes ___ No ___ No opinion ___

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

Why do you think this way? 

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

Why or why not? 

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

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

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

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

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

88. What is your reaction when this happens? 

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

90. Do you think that Hispanic young people in the US are losing touch with their culture? Yes ___ No ___ Don’t know ___

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for getting jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for conducting business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for social mobility and prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for higher salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for promoting religious unity in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for creating a sense of unity within the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for spreading social and cultural values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language attitude, choice and shift
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92. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding U.S.-born Americans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would invite them to be a guest in my house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to work with them at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be friends with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to have them as a neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not object to being related to them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would accept them as a team captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would trust them with secrets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like them as a roommate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not mind eating in their house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would participate with them in sports and games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

93. To be Hispanic you need to speak Spanish.   
94. Hispanics who don’t know Spanish divide the community.  
95. All Hispanics should also be able to speak English.  
96. When I have children, I want them to be bilingual.  
97. It is important to communicate in English at home.  
98. Spanish is changing because of contact with English.  
99. In what way(s) has Spanish changed?  
100. English is changing because of contact with Spanish.  
101. In what way(s) has English changed?  
102. It is important to me to speak Spanish.  
103. Hispanic young people in the US don't want to speak Spanish.  
104. Hispanic young people in the US don’t know how to speak Spanish well.  
105. It is better to teach English to Hispanic children as early as possible.  
106. It is not good for children to learn two languages (Spanish and English) when they are still young.  
107. I believe that students would learn more effectively if they were taught in their mother tongue.  
108. A person who does not know how to speak Spanish can learn to speak it perfectly.
109. My knowledge of English and ability to speak it fluently make me feel superior to those who don’t know it.

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

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

112. American culture has destroyed Hispanic culture.

113. Hispanics in the US have maintained their culture.

114. Hispanics in the US have maintained Spanish.

115. Hispanics in the US suffer discrimination.

116. Hispanic in the US suffer discrimination because of language problems.

117. Hispanics in the US are united.

118. Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Are there any comments you would like to make about the questionnaire?
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American Tongues spoken by regional English speakers
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c8blqMALnA8&feature=related

Association for Teaching and Learning Indigenous Languages of Latin America (ATLILLA)
http://www.iu.edu/~atlilla/

Association for Teaching and Learning Indigenous Languages of Latin America (ATLILLA On Facebook)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Enduring Voices: Documenting the Planet’s Endangered Languages
http://travel.nationalgeographic.com/travel/enduring-voices/

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Language Policy and Planning and Language Revitalization around the World (Facebook)  

Linguistic discrimination - African American English  
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WWIblA9BltQ

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Terralingua  
http://www.terralingua.org/  
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4kW3K3OclnE

The Process and Factors of the Language Shift and Maintenance: A Sociolinguistic Research in Romanian Minority Community in Hungary  
http://rss.archives.ceu.hu/archive/00001155/01/167.pdf

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

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